Syndicate
nderies

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXIX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 1934 NUMBER 1015

Contents

The Week 1

Editorials

Nonsense about War Debts 3
The Utilities Overreach Themselves 4
The Pulitzer Awards 5
The Courts and the Right to Strike 6

General Articles

The Spread of Sadism ..... William Orton 7
Italy Confronts the Crisis ..... B. J. Field 9
No Santa Claus ..... Bruce Bliven 12
China Takes to the Air ..... Harrison Forman 14
Kentucky Hill Dance ..... Jesse Stuart 15
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 16
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 18
On the Labor Front ..... William P. Mangold 19
It's Up to the Kiddies ..... Otis C. Ferguson 20

Correspondence 20

The Lady from the Sea ..... Stark Young 22

Books in Review

The Man of Feeling ..... Horace Gregory 23
The Secret International ..... Quincy Howe 24
The World We Live In ..... John Dos Passos 25
Morituri Salutamus ..... Frederick L. Schuman 25
Books in Brief 26

The Week

BECAUSE Japan declined voluntarily to cut her exports to the British Crown Colonies, the British Board of Trade has imposed quotas to protect the markets for British manufacturers. This indicates the danger always lurking in competitive international trade. Japan, with a low level of real wages, has further reduced her costs in terms of foreign currency by depreciating the yen. Aggressively seeking foreign markets, she has found them all over the world, and very largely at the expense of British cotton industries. Therefore these industries cry out for protection. At the same time, Britain fears a trade war carried to further extremes, because other important industries, notably the armament makers, sell large quantities of goods to Japan. Either international trade will be further restricted by British retaliation in defense of Lancashire, or Lancashire will be still further depressed. How different would be the case if the world had a socialized industrial system! Britain could say, "We are much obliged for the gift of cotton goods made so much more cheaply than we can make them for ourselves. We shall be able to clothe a lot more people well than we ever could before. Meanwhile we can turn our own productive energies to better use. Of course you don't need arms, but we'll buy your cotton fabrics with machinery and steel products of all sorts that we can make better than you; and in addition we shall be able to feed and house our own people to much better advantage."

TWO observations occur to us on reading that twenty-eight prominent industrialists, presidents of business corporations claiming to speak for 450,000 firms "with no Wall Street connections," have asked for the modification of the stock-market bill. One is that most of these men probably have not studied the bill and never would have come together to oppose it unless behind the scenes there were working a capable public-relations counsel, paid a high fee for marshaling as many influential battalions as possible in order to make the headlines and impress Congress. Capitalist propaganda of the usual sort is on its feet again after its faltering during the crisis, and is mobilizing its cohorts, the badly informed as well as those who know what they are doing. It is interesting to speculate, whenever one of these drives is made against a bill that affects one interest or another, whose hand is pulling the strings. The other observation is that this incident gives little encouragement to those who see "industry" and "finance" as two separate interests under capitalism, and who expect to find one opposing the other.

WHATEVER may be thought of the success of the A.A.A. in restricting agricultural output, there is little question that it has been unable, through codes or agreements, to narrow much the spread between what the farmers receive for their crops and what the consumers pay. Processors and distributors are still virtually unregulated in the public interest. An interesting reaction to this situation is the introduction of the Frazier-Sinclair Bill to set up a government marketing corporation with an initial capital of $500,000,000 and power to buy, process and sell farm products. The purpose of the legislation is declared to be to "provide a market for the sale of agricultural products, and to elimi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nate as far as possible the commissions and charges that are exacted upon agricultural products from the time such products leave the producer until the same reach the consumer, and to thereby increase the price which the producer receives and decrease the price which the consumer pays." There is a good deal of evidence to show that in the case of certain commodities such as milk, there is in distribution a considerable margin of profit that could thus be squeezed out. There is a good deal more evidence to show that a comprehensive effort to eliminate waste in distribution would yield still greater savings. We take it for granted, however, that a "socialistic" measure of this kind would be fought to the death by the private interests concerned—if there were any chance of its passage.

IN HIS article, "China Takes to the Air," appearing on page fourteen of this issue, Mr. Harrison Forman gives a first-hand account of the purchase of American airplanes by the Nanking government in China, and its effect upon the internal political situation of that country. He omits, however, one very important fact: that the airplanes Nanking has been buying so lavishly are not at present being used against the Japanese but against Chinese Communists in "Red China," which is now an area of several thousand square miles, and according to many estimates has as many as sixty to eighty million inhabitants. The Communists have hardly any airplanes at all, and Nanking finds this sort of attack tremendously effective, so much so that its 300 fighting planes are probably more valuable to it than some 600,000 men whom we hear, from sources hitherto reliable, it has in the field. The Nanking armies don't enjoy fighting against their oppressed fellow countrymen, and sometimes whole divisions desert to the Reds. Actually, the danger that the fighting planes will ever be used against Japan seems remote, in view of the present understanding between Nanking and Tokyo; indeed, it appears more likely that some day a joint Sino-Japanese air fleet might operate against the Chinese Soviets than that Chiang Kai-shek would ever attack his wealthy and powerful Japanese friends. Japan's recently expressed annoyance over the sale of military equipment to Nanking was probably less that it was military than that it wasn't Japanese-manufactured.

MEANWHILE, it is not very pretty to think of American aviators who for a few hundred dollars (Mex) per month, are dropping bombs on, and decimating with machine guns, Chinese revolutionaries who are fighting to rescue themselves and millions of their fellow countrymen from the most degraded forms of wage slavery and rural serfdom that the world has ever known. The Hessians who fought alongside the British in our own Revolutionary War have been for 160 years in this country a symbol for contemptible behavior; but we submit that the [illegible] led as quite respectable heroes alongside these American aviators in China. The Hessians fought man to man, and risked their own lives. The American aviator who drops bombs on the Chinese runs about as much risk as though he went through the infants' ward of a hospital with an axe.

IN The New Republic of May 9, we published a few melancholy words deploring the lack of vigilance with which some American newspapers seem to be edited just now. The occasion was a press-association dispatch that seems to have been rather widely printed, quoting some remarks by one of the editors of this paper, in the course of which he referred to the total population of the earth. Through a typographical error in the dispatch as sent out, the population was referred to as 228,000,000, which is of course only about a ninth of the total. Last week, some fifty or sixty clippings of this item had come back to us, and in only two of them had the error been corrected. In the intervening week, the number has greatly increased, and the honor roll of papers that caught the mistake is enlarged to five. Gentlemen, we give you: the copy desks of The Miami Herald, San Angelo, Texas, Times, Denison, Texas, Herald, Nashville Tennessean and the West Palm Beach, Florida, Post.

FOLLOWING close on the suggestion of Prussia's Prime Minister that the state must resort to more drastic measures against Marxian propagandists comes a German edict creating a special People's Court before which are to be tried persons charged with propaganda against the National Socialist government. The new tribunal is empowered to pass death sentences upon "persons found guilty of treasonable acts such as the distribution of illegal propaganda literature and phonograph records and the erection of unlicensed radio stations." The edict merely extends to the entire Reich the earlier Prussian decree of General Göring instructing the courts of Prussia to punish with death the distribution of oppositional newspapers, leaflets and other "treasonable matter."

WHAT does it mean? Has revolutionary sentiment increased? Well informed observers in Germany deny it. "One year has passed since the collapse of the Social Democratic and Communist parties," writes a correspondent familiar with underground activity in the Reich, "and what remained of the old organizations has been destroyed. . . . Young men and women are heroic in their efforts to maintain contacts between groups and persons. But they are weak and ineffective. A section of the city that once had several thousand members now has eight or nine. . . ." If that is the case, why such draconic methods? Because Germany's rulers fear that public resentment over decreased wages, in a country deprived of every legal vehicle of working-class expression, may find unexpected and [illegible] forcible expression illegally. "The authorities are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aware," writes the Berlin correspondent of the Neue Züricher Zeitung, "of a certain feeling of uncertainty and dissatisfaction among the employees of the large factories of Berlin. Everything points to a change in popular sentiment, slow but unmistakable. What will happen when the new labor laws go into effect after the first of May?"

Nonsense About War Debts

THE REPORT by the Attorney General regarding the status of various European countries under the Johnson Law may be good legal doctrine, but that is about all one can say for it. In nearly every aspect it violates common sense and flies in the face of past facts and present conditions.

Mr. Cummings' opinion is still subject, of course, to review by the courts; but in the meantime, American policy will be conducted in the light of his ruling. He says that those European countries which have made "token payments" are not in default on their war debts. These are five in number—Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Latvia and Lithuania. There is also of course Finland, unique among the nations in that it continues to pay the United States in full. All other European countries that have borrowed from the United States are considered in default, and further credits for them by private individuals in America are prohibited.

Soviet Russia is also regarded as in default. It has never borrowed money from the United States, but it confiscated the property of some private American business firms, and there is of course the loan of $187,000,000 made to the Kerensky government which was in control of Russia for a few months in 1917. The Johnson Law does not prevent loans by the American government or government corporations to a defaulting nation; and Mr. Cummings' opinion therefore ought not to affect credits to Russia of the sort heretofore contemplated, through the Export-Import Bank. In fact, however, the directors of the bank made a curious and unexplained ruling that they would assume that the Johnson Law covered their own Russian operations.

After all, as regards every nation except Russia and Finland, the question whether they are now in default will soon become an academic one. Mr. Cummings' ruling that token payments made in the past exempt the countries concerned from the operation of the law does not extend to future payments of the same character. He based it, in what seems a rather dubious way, upon the public interpretations of the token payments made by the President and upon the debate in Congress while the law was under discussion. It is reasonable to suppose that future token payments mean automatic default; the legal advisers of the State Department have already announced that they so interpret Mr. Cummings' ruling. Everybody in the world knows that the European debtors have not the faint

tention of making any more full payments on the instalments as they come due. It is barely possible that Great Britain and one or two other countries may offer to settle for a lump sum of ten cents on the dollar, though the past record of Congress would indicate that such payments would probably be refused. Nor is the attitude of these debtors mere stubbornness and the desire to repudiate a just debt. They point out that for the past fourteen years, the United States has refused to permit them to pay, or at least has made such payment heartbreakingly difficult. By our tariff, we have done our best to keep European goods out of this country; yet as every economist knows, though most other people constantly forget it, large international payments can be transferred over a long period of time only when the debtor country sends to the creditor a much larger volume of goods than it receives in return. While Mr. Roosevelt plans some lowering of tariffs, on a reciprocal basis, neither he nor anyone else has the slightest intention of permitting the war debts to be paid in this manner. That is one reason why Mr. Cummings' ruling is a fantastic bit of unreality. It is like making a corpse the honor guest at a banquet and pretending all evening that he is as full of vigorous life as anyone else who is present.

In another aspect, Mr. Cummings' opinion leaves a hole in the Johnson Law as wide as the Grand Canyon. He says that while a country in default cannot raise money from private sources in the United States, any subdivision of that country can do so provided it likewise is not a defaulter on an American obligation. Assume for the sake of argument that France wanted to borrow some more money, and believed she could raise it in this country—on the whole, an unlikely assumption. All she need do to satisfy this law is to offer the new securities in the names of some of the French Departments, or municipalities. This ruling makes the law seem more than ever a futile gesture of international ill will, which, in fact, is all it was ever intended to be.

The case of Russia is different, and somewhat more serious. Mr. Cummings quotes international law to the effect that a revolutionary government is not permitted to repudiate the external debts of its predecessor; and everyone knows how this attitude came into existence. Otherwise, a country with an embarrassingly large foreign debt could simply go through an artificial revolution, wipe the slate clean, and come up smiling. At the same time, there is a peculiar absurdity in applying such a rule to the Soviet government. That government was not merely one set of men seizing power from another; it was a repudiation of private capitalism and of capitalist imperialism as these were represented by the Kerensky government. The $187,000,000 represented in the loan to Kerensky was intended to be used in the prosecution of Russia's part in the Great War—a war of which the new

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

withdrew at the earliest possible moment. As we said last week, there is reason to believe that some of this money afterward went to equip counter-revolutionary White Armies which invaded Russia and sought to overthrow her government. To ask the U.S.S.R. to pay back this money is about as though a burglar entered someone's house, tried to shoot him and then sent in a bill for wasted ammunition. In the case of Russia, the obvious, sensible solution is for a Mixed Claims commission to be set up at the earliest possible moment to hear the cases of both countries (Russia has a large bill against us for the Archangel expedition), to decide that all these claims cancel out, and for us to go ahead with Russian trade as originally planned.

In regard to the war debts, what we have repeatedly said in the past remains true. The debtors have no intention of paying them; they couldn't if they wanted to, without a change in our policy; such a change would probably cost us more than the debts are worth; the wisest solution is to recognize the fact that they are dead and go on to the restoration of international trade with which they are now, to some extent, interfering. Meantime, we may be permitted a couple of hearty chuckles up the sleeve at the spectacle of solemn rulings by a legal King Canute. The Western European countries that, like ourselves, continue to do lip service to the orthodox theory of capitalism, are solemnly pronounced in good standing, even though they owe us billions they don't intend to pay. Soviet Russia, which does not support the theory of private capitalism, is listed, with a straight face, as being in default though she doesn't owe us a nickel. We wait for some irreverent fellow to come along and suggest that it doesn't matter what you do, just so long as you continue to sing the right hymns in the right church.

The Utilities Overreach Themselves

ONE OF the happier by-products of the depression is the fresh air of realism beginning to blow through the chambers of the United States Supreme Court. The Court's new attitude, strikingly disclosed in the Minnesota mortgage case and the New York milk case, has manifested itself most recently in the field of public-utility rate regulation. Litigation over local telephone rates in the Chicago area, which had become almost perennial, has at length terminated in a complete victory for telephone patrons. And on the same day the Court handed down a decision rejecting, on not dissimilar grounds, inflated claims with respect to local gas rates of the Dayton Light and Power Company, a subsidiary of Columbia Gas and Electric.

The Chicago case is the more important, and certainly the more dramatic. It began in 1923 with an ing rates. Promptly the company obtained a temporary injunction from the federal court, conditioned upon repayment to telephone users of the excess of the old rates over the new, if the injunction were eventually dissolved. Now the company is faced with the formidable task of distributing to its patrons a fund in excess of $21,000,000. Meanwhile the litigation has been pursuing its wasteful and interminable course, finally winding itself into a maze of such infinite complexity that it cost $25,000 on this most recent appeal (the fourth since 1925) simply to print for the highest court the record of what had happened. If this were not such a miserable display of maladministration and misgovernment, it would be laughable. It would be especially laughable because in the end the greater part of the work represented by 5,066 pages of record and 1,192 pages of counsel's briefs proved unnecessary. The case was decided on other and simpler grounds.

The statutory three-judge court, in decreeing a permanent injunction, made detailed findings of valuation and return for each year from 1923 to 1932, findings largely accepted from the company's figures. These figures led to this startling conclusion: that not only were the new rates in suit grossly confiscatory but the old rates also—rates to which the company had adhered without complaint and on which it had prospered mightily. If the figures were correct, said the Supreme Court, the company had been "receiving a net return of $5,347,533, when it was entitled to nearly $4,000,000 more, or $9,315,000, to prevent its property from being confiscated." "Surely," The New Republic commented on September 6, 1933, when the lower court's decision was announced, "this is the *reductio ad absurdum* of prevailing doctrines of utility valuation. If the learned judges of the highest court will compare these figures with the dividend record and financial rating of the Illinois Bell Telephone Company . . . and ask themselves the simple question, 'Does this make sense?' they may be prompted to examine more critically the process of legal legerdemain by which the court below arrived at so preposterous a result."

Chief Justice Hughes, speaking for a unanimous court, followed precisely this line of approach. "The financial history of the Illinois Company," he said, "repels the suggestion that during all these years it was suffering from confiscatory rates." Whereupon he reviewed this history, and concluded, "Elaborate calculations which are at war with realities are of no avail. The glaring incongruity between the effect of the findings below . . . and the actual result of the company's business makes it impossible to accept those findings as a basis of decision."

The findings were accordingly discarded. That the new rates would reduce the annual revenue of the company by approximately $1,500,000 was not disputed. Since experience had proved the exist-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charge against net revenue sufficient to offset this reduction was all that was needed to defeat the attack on the new rates. Such a charge (among many other items, scarcely less questionable, pointed out in the appellants' briefs) the Chief Justice found in examining the company's accounting practice with respect to depreciation reserve.

In computing the fair value of the property on which it was entitled to earn a return, the company determined the cost of reproduction new (estimated as high as possible) and subtracted the actual accrued depreciation (estimated as low as possible). Accrued depreciation throughout the period from 1923 to 1931 stood at an average of $14,649,444. In computing its net return (estimated as low as possible) the Company subtracted from gross revenue its operating expenses (estimated as high as possible). Among the operating expenses it included an annual contribution for depreciation reserve, namely, the amount theoretically necessary to replace decrease in the value of the property not restored by current maintenance. Throughout the nine-year period the depreciation reserve stood at an average of $38,296,333. In 1923 the reserve for depreciation on the company's own showing, exceeded the accrued depreciation by $14,805,000. Annually thereafter this surplus was increased by an average amount of $2,056,092, an unnecessary charge against net return amply sufficient to offset the effect of the reduction in rates.

Nor was this all. Not content with so handsome a provision for the future at the expense of telephone rate payers, the company charged to current maintenance each year an average of $8,626,899, an expenditure that had served to maintain the property continuously at 91-percent condition (at 92 percent in the last three years). Thus, again on the company's own figures, the property actually was scarcely depreciating at all. Plainly these calculations, in the language of the Supreme Court itself, "overshot the mark." The Chief Justice was able neatly to hoist the company by its own petard.

A similar technique was used by Mr. Justice Cardozo in dismissing the utility's contentions in the Dayton case. The company argued that even the higher rates which it was seeking to introduce would produce a return of only 1.28 percent. "So modest a rate," the Justice said mildly, "suggests an inflation of the base on which the rate has been computed. . . . The argument proves too much; the valuations are discredited by the teachings of experience. Men do not transact business without protest at confiscatory rates. . . ."

Implicit in both these decisions is an abandonment of the more fantastic unrealities of reproduction-cost valuation. It is too early to say how far, doctrinally, this abandonment may be carried. For the present, it is the temper of the two opinions that is important. Adherence to that temper will do more than any other single factor to prevent repetition of such costly futilities as the Chicago rate or any of the other qualities that cause books to proceedings. Of even greater immediate signif- cance, it will encourage state public-utility commissions to more energetic defense of consumers' interests. Mr. Justice Cardozo in the Dayton case seemed scarcely to conceal his private opinion when he said, "Whether a lower rate could be upheld is a question not before us." And utility commissioners should be astute to inquire whether the accounting practices of other Bell operating companies resemble those of the Illinois company.

The Pulitzer Awards

WHEN WE heard about this year's Pulitzer awards, we went paging back through bound volumes of The New Republic to see what our reviewers had said about these works in the days when they first appeared, before there was any thought of their winning prizes. We found that T. S. Matthews, who reviewed "Lamb in His Bosom," thought that it was "a very good book," but he also thought that it was "too quiet and slow, too backwoodsy to be a best-seller, unless it were very extensively ballyhooed." He was pretty close to being right about it, too. Until it won the Pulitzer prize, "Lamb in His Bosom" belonged to the category of novels that all the critics like and almost nobody reads.—Stark Young reviewed "Men in White," and thought it a good play, one that paid its audience the compliment of taking them "as full human beings in the midst of a living world." But he also thought that the work of the actors and the producers, the whole spirit of the Theatre Group, was more significant than the author's text.—"The People's Choice," by Herbert Agar, which won the award in American history, was reviewed briefly and respectfully, but not warmly, by Robert Morss Lovett; he called it "a fine example of historical criticism."—John Wheelwright said that Robert Hillyer, whose "Collected Verse" won the poetry award, was "his generation's most accomplished academician," but he doesn't like academicians. Wheelwright is probably one of the many poets who felt strongly that the award should have gone to Hart Crane's "Collected Poems," which appeared during the same year.—Granville Hicks thought that Tyler Dennett's biography of John Hay, the last of the five prize winners, was a scholarly and thorough study of Hay's life and "left little room for further research," but he disagreed strongly with the author's judgment of Hay's career.

Such were the first judgments of these five reviewers—favorable on the whole, but not enthusiastic. Most of them would now say that the Pulitzer Committee this year made an average selection, neither strikingly better nor worse than those of former years, and as usual showing more favor toward sound average works than toward those distinguished by originality, painful honesty

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Courts and the Right to Strike

LAST WEEK'S decision of New Jersey's highest tribunal, the Court of Errors and Appeals, upholding the right of workers to strike and picket peacefully, is of unusual significance for two reasons. It reveals, in the first place, the extraordinary abuse to which the injunction is put in labor cases—an abuse that the N.R.A. has done little to offset and, in some instances, has actually aggravated. And it demonstrates again the utter inadequacy of present legislation to protect workers from reactionary judges in the lower state courts.

The New Jersey ruling holds that Vice-Chancellor John J. Fallon was "clearly in error" in granting the Bayonne Textile Corporation a temporary injunction against officials and members of the American Federation of Silk Workers, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor. When the Bayonne company applied for an injunction last September, its employees, under the leadership of the A.F. of L., had gone on strike to unionize the plant. In an amazing opinion, Vice-Chancellor Fallon declared that to strike or picket for this purpose was illegal. "Unionization," he said, "is not a lawful object of a strike. . . . The federal Recovery Act does not warrant interference by persons other than employees—by intermeddlers such as organizers. . . . Collective bargaining must be the result of mutual individual action by both."

To distort more completely the plain meaning of the Recovery Act would be difficult. And the higher court has now frankly said so. Section 7a, its opinion points out, "confers on employees the right to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, which connotes the right to strike." To prohibit peaceful picketing and striking, in line with Vice-Chancellor Fallon's reasoning, would "emasculate and devitalize" this provision. "The right to strike," the Court observed, "includes the right to use peaceable and lawful means to induce present employees and expectant employees to join the ranks." Taking up another point in the injunction, which held that arbitration must be confined to members of the striking employees, the Court declared that this would have the effect, in practice, of outlawing the A.F. of L., a perfectly legal labor organization, and would prevent workers from affiliating their "individual unions with a body organized to promote the common aims and purposes." These remarks are, to be sure, no more than ordinary common sense. But it is part of the irony of our present judicial system that one is forced to hail the opinion as an "enlightened" one—even though it comes some eight months too late to be of any value to the workers at the Bayonne plant.

It is precisely this long delay in appeal that makes is the lower state courts that pass on the bulk of industrial disputes and it is the lower justices who have virtually a free rein in issuing temporary injunctions. It is well known that they frequently issue them on flimsy and inadequate grounds—sometimes on nothing more than the unsubstantiated complaint of an employer that his business is being adversely affected by labor activities. Commenting on "Injunctions Since the N.R.A.," The Yale Law Journal reported in its February issue that "the N.R.A. has been totally unsuccessful in impelling these tribunals, traditionally unsympathetic to labor, even to follow the policies enunciated by the superior courts of their states. This contrast is most marked in the doctrines laid down by the lower and higher courts in New York." The Court of Appeals has consistently held to a "hands off" policy, but the lower courts have issued some of the most stringent injunctions—even against peaceful picketing. And though it is apparent that many of the temporary injunctions issued would later be thrown out of court on appeal, the fact remains that they seldom are appealed. The time involved in obtaining a court review renders that review valueless, even if it is favorable; for meanwhile the strike has usually been broken and the strikers' morale undermined.

What is clearly needed is state legislation similar to the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act. Such state laws would permit the lower courts to enjoin only acts of specific fraud and violence. They would prohibit the issuance of temporary injunctions on mere affidavits. Even more important, they would assure a jury trial for all alleged violations. This would prevent the injustice that has recently taken place in Red Bank, New Jersey, where five clothing workers were sent to jail for peaceful picketing—for violating an injunction almost identical with the one the Court of Errors and Appeals has now declared invalid. Two of these workers, serving ninety-day sentences, are still in jail. Since 1931, ten states have enacted general labor-injunction laws. It is only with this form of protection at the very beginning of a labor dispute that the rights of workers to organize, strike and picket peacefully can have reality.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1934, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT. DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD
GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Spread of Sadism

RECENT years have seen a steady growth, in three or four western nations, of a quite peculiar form of social coercion. Coercion itself exerted by other groups than those officially empowered to use force is nothing new; neither is cruelty. But cruelty manifesting itself as perversion, systematically practised and sanctioned by legally organized groups in the community, is comparatively novel and highly significant. Of what, it is worth while to inquire.

The castor-oil treatment, as a regular technique, seems to have originated in Italian fascism. It is a practice obviously necessitating the coöperation of two or three individuals upon a victim already overpowered; and it is difficult to suppose that a single individual, acting alone, would experience the amusement or gratification that the method is said to afford its practitioners. The sexual implication is obvious. Recent reports indicate the adoption of this technique by Sir Oswald Mosley's English Black Shirts, while its use in Germany is well attested. Other practices—the various forms of beating and physical humiliation—in most of which the sexual reference is also fairly direct, need not be detailed here; but one passage must be cited from a report of conditions in the Sonnenberg concentration camp during the latter part of 1933:

> To mention in detail the insults and ill treatment meted out to these three Jews would be too much; they can be imagined after what I have said. The two sons were not only beaten all day long in the quadrangle but also at night. Their shrieks kept all the prisoners in the east wing awake. When they washed they received blows without interruption on their naked bodies, which soon were as black as those of most of the prisoners who had been in the hands of Adrian. One day the Jews had to carry full pails of excrement and to go marching and jumping with them. When the excrement fell out, they had to put it back with their hands. . . . Both the sons attempted suicide, but, being strictly guarded, it was in vain. Several times both the sons were misused by homosexual Storm Troop guards who were on night duty in the east wing.

The range of practices roughly indicated by the above extremes presents a phase of social psychology that has certain clear characteristics, intrinsic and extrinsic. So far as a generalization can be made, it would appear that such practices are more characteristic of the bourgeoisie in revolutionary situations than of the proletariat; and this is in line with the undoubted fact that counter-revolutionary movements as a rule exhibit more unbridled ferocity than revolutionary ones. But sadistic coercion is obviously not a natural or necessary corollary to Semitic program of German fascism does not involve, as a logical necessity, the persecution of the Jews by these particular methods; nor are such methods confined either to anti-Semitic movements or to Germany. Austrian anti-Semitism, rigorous as it has been under Dollfuss, does not seem to have indulged to any great extent in sadistic methods; but English fascism, which is not primarily anti-Semitic, is beginning to show traces of them.

Neither is sadistic coercion a substitute for, or a consequence of, war as such. Sadistic tendencies do not express combative impulses, but rather their opposite. The sadistic personality is not of the type that seeks for genuinely combative situations; far from it. For that matter, modern war is not an expression of human bellicosity; it is rather the result of a type of social control that excludes all specifically human factors, good and bad alike. Similarly, sadistic coercion is not primarily a hangover from the experience of war. In modern war one very seldom sees the "enemy." The very word "enemy" is misapplied in this connection. There is no real "enemy," there is only an abstract concept of opposition to certain equally abstract aims embodied in a vast impersonal system of mechanical forces. But in sadistic situations the physical and psychological presence of another individual is of the essence. The relations are personal, though perverse.

Some light on the matter can be gained from Freud, who gives us the very useful concept of the regression of the libido, which he is careful to distinguish from repression. Regression arises from the blocking of the normal channels by factors other than the personal censorship; and instead of neuroses, which reflect the subconscious conflict set up in the latter case, we have a sort of compromise or *ersatz* solution involving the damming-up of the libido at what are actually primitive psychological levels. The common auto-erotic and anal-erotic are among these, with the various perversions as eddies and lagoons of this amorphous landscape. In these cases there is no inevitable neurosis, though difficult extrinsic situations may arise.

Now applying this analysis to the evidence, sadistic coercion appears as essentially a depression phenomenon of the petty bourgeoisie. Take first the latter term of the definition: why the bourgeoisie? Because in the higher social orders the libido-channels are never so completely blocked; while further, the integrating ego-factors do their work more efficiently, in difficult situations, than among the lower classes. That is one of the char-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why not the proletariat? Because, in its self-conscious section, the concentration of libido-drives on a radical, or revolutionary, aim has an integrating effect psychologically comparable to that of form, code and tradition in an aristocracy; while in its larger section, the life-impulses are already too far drained of vitality to give rise to any positive manifestation, psychotic or otherwise.

A depression phenomenon: that is, the psychological outcome of adverse conditions severe and protracted enough to cause a definite blocking of the normal channels, not only of action but of hope, aspiration and imagination. Certain evidences of this blocking are quite well known. For fifteen years, in Germany, the obstacles in the way of normal marriage, paternity and all that goes to make up what is called a successful career have been accumulating. Avenues of escape have seemed to open from time to time only to close again with the tantalizing monotony of a nightmare; and this has particularly affected the young men of the post-war generation, who feel they have been born under a manifold curse.

The Austrian temperament manages to shake off a good deal of this; but not the German. The German bourgeois needs the ideology, and the idealism, that are rooted in the normal development of sex and association; the fact and the feeling of frustration do him an ineluctable harm. If to a hungry man you continually proffer food that he may not have, his mind will presently revolt against both it and you, in a fit of crazy rage. How important these considerations are may be judged from the tremendous efforts of the fascist leaders to persuade their young men that marriage is possible, that it is feasible and worth while to beget children, and that careers are open, or can be laid open by force if necessary. In the meantime, homosexuality gains much of its vogue from the fact that it involves no social responsibility for others in a world in which such responsibility has become a burden and an obsession instead of a privilege and a fulfilment.

Again, the sense of national humiliation out of which fascism springs has momentous consequences for the average individual. There is a deep and intimate connection between the concept of the nation and the personal psychology of its constituents; the projection of personal urges into the state-idea, which takes place in all of us to some degree, is one of the basic associative channels of sublimation. Therefore, injury to the state-idea—not merely to the *de-facto* state but to its ideal image as that exists in people's minds—involves, without any mediation whatever, a lesion of the individual psyche, which tends to react by violent manifestations of individual arrogance, individual domination. Here also we may discern the importance of the injury by the conspicuous efforts of Italian, German and British fascists to restore, not merely the power of the state (identified with themselves) but the glamor, the ritual, the fairy-tale atmosphere that used to to an exceptional social and political ordeal, and

But while these considerations give some explanation of the spread of sadistic coercion, there remains a further, and a graver, possibility, for which no proof, but only presumption, can be offered. The possibility is this: normal social relations subsist only at the cost of a continuous and exacting psychological adjustment on the part of each and every individual; in return for this the maintenance of an organized society confers certain important satisfactions in compensation for, but quite different from, those that have to be given up. This is really no more than a restatement of the social-contract theory (which fascism emphatically rejects). There may arise situations in which this transaction becomes *too expensive* for the average individual; too much is demanded in relation to the little that is conferred. And it is possible that democracy now constitutes one of these situations.

If this is the case, we should expect two main reactions: a reaction against democracy itself, as the source of these intolerably exacting demands and the cheat when it comes to the other side of the bargain; and, second, a growing tendency on the part of individuals to become *unsocialized*, to break away psychologically from the area of democratic solidarity. Both reactions are conspicuous and increasing.

That something like this was brewing in the last stages of Italian and German democracy is strongly suggested by the nature of the fascist victims. Fascism is, among other things, the revolt of exasperated minds against the endless argument, the insistent demand for patience and reasonableness, involved in the democratic procedure and assumptions. Nothing seemed to come of all that in proportion to the intolerable strain. Fascism therefore rebels against the rule of reason, of ideas: it hates ideas as such, it wants actualities, deeds instead of words, blood instead of theories. Its converts give up the prerogative of independent thought with a sigh of relief, not of regret. They seek a tighter, more homogeneous, and therefore *simpler* community, not a broader, more varied, international one: a community that will make fewer demands upon the overstrained personal controls and release those pent-up passions that would wreck the unstable structure of the liberal state. This too is a species of regression, and it is affecting democracy everywhere.

The *Führer* principle is the positive complement of this. It implies, not the subjugation of the individual, but his blessed release from a burden of social responsibility, moral and intellectual, that was becoming altogether too much for him. Henceforth he may live less by his brains and more by his emotions; and among his emotions is undoubtedly the trace of masochism that is invariably found in association with the trace of sadism. To some extent, no doubt, both are phases of a temporary reaction

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which psychic energies may flow along freer and broader chanels. It is an open question, however, whether the limits of bearable strain are not approaching in the democracies that have not yet gone fascist. If an elastic body is strained beyond a certain limit, it loses the power to recover when the strain is removed. If the strain is increased, its structure permanently breaks down. The breakdown, which is that of the body as a whole, actually consists in a change of relations between its component particles. And in the case of so unwieldy a body as a democracy, it is there that the first symptoms may be looked for.

WILLIAM ORTON.

Italy Confronts the Crisis

FASCISMO has been in power in Italy for over eleven years; its rule has been undisputed for more than seven. Since it has had every opportunity to consolidate itself before the world crisis broke over it, it is not unfair to ask a few quite definite questions: How has Italy, the first fascist state, fared in the world crisis?

The trumpets of official publicity, usually so sweetly tuned to the notes of praise, have been silent on this matter. The investigator who wants to form an opinion for himself must wade unaided through a mazy forest of statistics, primarily those of the Italian government and of officially recognized bodies. Yet these must be treated with caution, for fascismo itself has openly stated that statistics are an instrument of state policy. Reports of the United States Department of Commerce and of the League of Nations also provide some primary raw material for the student, scantier but not so open to question.

These facts point to the following conclusions: Italy has been affected by the crisis not less and not otherwise than the other great industrial nations, but, to a greater extent than elsewhere, the burdens of the crisis have been shifted from big business and large-scale agriculture to the broad masses of the population. There is the further conclusion that Italy has still to settle a whole range of problems —excessive debt burden (a heritage of excessive capital investment from the boom times), the danger of inflation, the increasing constriction of markets—which are precisely those that the other industrially advanced nations have to face. Fascism as a method of organizing the economic life of a nation has thus far given a negative result in its first great test.

The crisis in Italy has lasted eight years, as against four in other countries. The world catastrophe that broke out in 1929 was superimposed in Italy on a national crisis that began in 1926, with the stabilization of the lira at 5.26 cents. From then until 1929, however, Italy was borrowing heavily from the United States, and these loans helped to maintain the appearance of stability and retard the collapse.

Even with the help of loans, however, the "private" Italian crisis of 1926-29 is sufficiently indi- from an average of 1,076,000 ton-kilometers a month in 1926 to 1,017,000 in 1929, monthly exports from 18,665,000,000 lire to 15,228,000,000, and banknote circulation from 18,340,000,000 to 16,774,000,000. With the outbreak of the world crisis, and the cessation of foreign lending, the "private" Italian crisis passed into a new phase, became a part of the international crisis.

If we use as our criterion the percentage decline in world exports between 1929 and 1933, the fascist state has shown no special ability to maintain its foreign trade under adverse circumstances. Its exports in 1933 amounted to 5,980,000,000 lire. This was the lowest figure since 1919; it was 60.7 percent below the figure of 1929, and even below the figure of 1921, when the lira was worth more, when export markets were disorganized by the first post-war crisis, when workers were occupying Italian factories and when the threat of "anarchy" brought the property-owning classes flocking to the banner of Mussolini.

Compared with Italy's decline of 60.7 percent in export trade, Germany, torn by political turmoil, suffered a decline of only 61.5 percent; France, 63.1 percent, and the United Kingdom 49.5 percent. The United States, hardest-hit of all industrial nations in such a comparison because of the terrific boom of 1929, lost only 68 percent of its export-trade values of 1929.

The world crisis, then, has destroyed foreign markets for Italy as well as for the other industrial nations. What compensations have been provided by militant economic nationalism in the shape of a broadening demand for goods in the domestic market, in which fascist policy put its hopes? A measure of its success is given by the statement in the report of the parliamentary budget commission last year, "The decrease of national income in the United States since the crisis has been a third of the total; in Italy it has been about the same."

The basic program of economic nationalism with which Italian fascism attempted to meet the crisis involved a policy of grandiose expenditures for public works, for irrigation, drainage, reclamation, etc. These measures were intended to increase production, provide employment and reduce the depend-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tacular of these was the famous "battle of wheat," which began in the fall of 1926. It is worth studying this "battle" in some detail in order to obtain an idea of the methods and results of the policy of economic nationalism, when it is successful, as is claimed in this case.

Wheat is by far the most important cereal crop of Italy, making up about two-thirds of the total food and feed stuffs produced. Yet Italy has had to import a quarter or more of its total wheat requirements. Il Duce determined to put a stop to this. The production of wheat was to be increased, imports were to be reduced or eliminated. However, the conditions for growing more wheat in Italy are not favorable. According to a standard Italian annual statistical reference work, loyal to the regime and confident of the success of its agricultural policy, "the Italian proportion of land devoted to agriculture seems fairly high; perhaps higher than sound norms of agricultural economy and technology would advise." How then was the battle of wheat to be won?

The natural conditions being unfavorable, it was necessary to resort to artificial methods: high duties, restrictions on imports through quotas and special regulations, keeping the internal price level far above the world market price, and creating a system of government price-support and compulsory syndicates *(consorzi obbligatori)* of wheat producers. The benefits would naturally go to the large-scale agriculturist, who normally has a large surplus to ship to market. The small peasant, who produces little above his own needs, would benefit little or not at all. The working class would pay, in the form of a lower standard of living expressed in the decreased consumption of wheat. Meantime, the government would necessarily go further into debt to finance the public-works program, its budget would become increasingly hard to balance, and the banks would become increasingly burdened with government paper. This is the real meaning of "victory" in the battle of wheat.

The first step actually taken was to restore the pre-war duty of 75 gold lire a ton. As is the nature of such things, this first step was followed by a series of increases in the duty bringing it finally to 160 gold lire a ton. As a result, Italian wheat is quoted in Italian markets at the equivalent of $2.06 a bushel, on a day when Chicago wheat is 86 cents and Winnipeg is quoted at 67 cents. Taking the price differential at $1 a bushel, this means a tax of over $300,000,000 a year on the 8,500,000 tons of wheat annually consumed in Italy. This is some $37 a year for each Italian family, whose breadwinner is doing well to earn $200 a year.

What have been the actual results in stimulating the production of wheat? Here some of the technical difficulties of Italian statistics confront us. In the first year of the "battle," 1926, the crop was reported at 6,000,000 tons, comparing with an average of 5,000,000 before the War, and with tions still carry elaborate footnotes explaining that the 1926 crop was "probably nearer" 5,500,000 tons, except that for "comparative purposes" in tabulations the original official estimate of 6,000,000 is still retained.

The following year, in fact, the crop as reported fell to 5,330,000 tons, although the acreage planted was higher than in 1926. A new record crop was reported in 1929, at 7,080,000 tons, but in the following year it was down again to 5,720,000 tons. In 1932 the crop was officially estimated to be 8,117,000 tons. This would be a remarkable showing, being 2,787,000 tons more than in 1927, with about the same acreage planted, and in spite of official complaints about the decreased use of fertilizer in recent years. Imports were still necessary, however; in 1932 they amounted to 1,056,000 tons, against 2,310,000 tons in 1927. In 1933 they were reduced to 466,000 tons.

Even assuming that no serious change will be made in the final official estimates of the 1933 crop, the total supply of wheat for the year (domestic production plus imports) was less than in 1928 and 1929, the figures being 8,583,000 tons, 8,960,000 and 8,840,000, respectively. Available supplies, and therefore presumably also total consumption of wheat, have been going down: a section of Italian agriculture has been supported at the expense of the standard of living of the masses.

Yet even such a victory has not prevented the exodus of population from the farm to the town; it has not even prevented an apparent acceleration in the rate of this migration. In the past decade, the population of cities numbering over 100,000 inhabitants has been increasing both absolutely and relatively faster than that of Italy as a whole.

But the program of public-works construction and the battle of wheat mean not only dear bread for the masses and profits for the big estate-owners; they also mean an increasing burden on government finance and banking, and a drain on the productive forces of the nation. More than that—if the government cannot reduce its expenses, and finds it hard to obtain new loans, and cannot raise its taxes sufficiently, it may find inflation the only way out. Government policy is thus linked with banking stability. To date, the question of inflation has not been raised in the form of an imperious "either-or," but developments point to that possibility.

The trouble began with the very stabilization of the lira itself. Experts (particularly, of course, those residing outside of Italy) at once criticized it on the ground that it priced the lira too high. In Italy, naturally, the government confesses to no mistakes. It has had to justify the high price of the lira by building up its value through rigorous deflation of bank circulation, prices, wages and incomes. Against these deflationary trends, however, the expenditures of the government itself have stood firm as a rock. In 1929-30 they amounted to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treasury of 170,000,000. In the following year, expenses rose to 20,891,000,000 lire, and the balance had been converted into a deficit of 504,000,000. By 1931-32 the expenditures had grown to 23,308,000,000, the deficit to 4,274,000,000. For the fiscal year 1932-33 expenditures were 23,307,000,000 and the deficit 4,264,000,000. In the six months July to December, 1933, both expenses and deficit were practically unchanged from the corresponding period a year before. No progress has been made toward balancing the Italian budget.

Apart from expenditures on public works, government expenses have remained high for two reasons: the burden of debt and the costs of the military apparatus have both remained inflexible. The latest figure of the public debt gives a total of 98,029,000,000 lire, estimated by an official source to represent a quarter of the total private wealth.

The expenditures of the Ministry of Finance, consisting for the most part of the service of the national debt, take up about 40 percent of the total budgeted expenditures. The burden will be reduced after January 1, 1937, by a recent conversion operation to the extent of 921,000,000 lire a year, or four percent of total expenditures. This operation affects over 60 percent of the entire debt, and was carried through under typically fascist conditions. Holders of the old five-percent bonds were offered a choice between conversion into 3½-percent bonds or taking cash, but they were not encouraged to follow the latter course.

And can we seriously expect Il Duce to order a reduction in the budget for army, navy and aviation, totaling 30 percent of all expenditures? But if there is to be no major reduction in war services or debt, totaling 70 percent of the budget, it is clear that expenses will not be cut appreciably.

Nor is the other way out, that of increasing revenues, any more easy of accomplishment. The Italian budget is constructed on the basis of spreading the load over the broad masses of the population, relying but little on the taxation of capital or profits. If the fascist regime has been unable to lighten the total burden of the crisis, it has at least succeeded in shifting this burden from the upper to the lower economic strata.

For example, 30 percent of all revenue is derived from indirect taxes on consumption, a further 19 percent from government monopolies in salt, tobacco and cigarette lighters, and 7 percent from a sales tax. All these are forms of taxation falling most heavily on the broad consuming masses. Even the income tax, which supplies 15 percent of total receipts, cuts deeply into the lower income levels. Of the taxes on business transactions, which account for another 15 percent, some items such as stamp taxes are normally shifted to consumers. The one non-transferable tax, that on capital, provides only 2½ percent of the total revenues.

The decline in government revenues in recent squeeze more out of the taxpaying masses. While expenses last year were higher than in 1929-30 or 1930-31, budgetary receipts were actually lower in 1932-33 than in any of the three preceding years. This has meant, of course, a series of deficits that have been plugged up by bank loans and bond issues.

Thus the weakness of Italian government finance has led to a weakening of the banking system. The Bank of Italy has been called upon, under pressure from the government, to supply credit to industry in the form of public aids. While the volume of trade and the price level have been declining, the discounts and advances of the Bank of Italy have increased. An Italian estimate indicates that two-thirds of these are financial paper, not self-liquidating commercial obligations. The quality of the Bank's assets has therefore been declining.

The Bank has also had to help mobilize and liquefy frozen investments in industrial securities, many of which represent the wreckage of the last boom. Under government auspices, attempts have been made to thaw these investments by creating new institutions to take them over and borrow against them. As a result, the previous holders of these securities were able to improve their liquid position, but only at the expense of the banks, which provided the cash.

All these demands—the financing of budget deficits, public aids to credit, the mobilization of credit for industrial securities—converge on the narrow shoulders of the investing class of Italy. The relation of these demands for funds to the available supply is shown by the high interest rates still prevailing in Italy after eight years of liquidation.

Meantime, gold has been leaking out of the country in spite of the most vigorous efforts on the part of the government to accumulate it, and in spite of fervid appeals to patriotic citizens to turn in their gold watches, gold pens, even gold wedding rings, to the Bank, to be paid for in paper lire. The Bank of Italy has been cashing in its holdings of foreign-exchange bills for gold as they have become due. Yet its holdings of gold have not increased so much as its holdings of foreign exchange have declined.

At the end of 1930 its holdings of gold amounted to 5,297,000,000 lire, and its holdings of foreign exchange to 4,327,000,000. As of a recent date, its holdings of gold had increased by 2,176,000,000, but its holdings of foreign exchange had shrunk by 4,053,000,000. The difference had disappeared out of the country, defying further efforts to trace it. This leakage of gold contrasts sharply with the continued accumulation of gold by England, France, the United States, Switzerland and Holland.

The budgetary and banking weaknesses, the loss of gold and the shortage of money, all taken together, indicate the existence of the risk of inflation. This would unquestionably result in a further wors

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sharpening of internal antagonisms. The Italian working class, deprived of its independent political life and of its own trade unions, has been unable to offer resistance to the wage cuts imposed on it since the crisis.

These cuts have undoubtedly been much deeper than is shown by the official statistics, according to which wages declined 15 percent from 1929 to 1932. It is known, for instance, that a horizontal cut of 8 percent was made in 1930, and one of 12 percent in the following year. On top of this, the various "labor protection laws" are thoroughly ineffective in practice in preventing wage cuts, arbitrary dismissals, short-time employment, evasion of legal notice before dismissal, etc. Judges have justified the utter disregard of such provisions by employers on the ground of "bad business conditions."

The General Fascist Federation of Industry has ruled that employers must reduce hours before dismissing workers, and that new workers must be taken on in preference to instituting overtime work. This form of the "stagger system" has undoubtedly had some effect in keeping official unemployment figures, and consequently officially estimated requirements for unemployment relief, lower than they would otherwise have been. According to government figures, unemployment has been hovering around one million for over a year. Officially registered unemployed workers numbered 1,158,418 at the end of January, 1934. The unemployed figures have shown a steady increase since July, 1933, when 824,195 were registered.

Wage cuts, part-time work, scanty relief, increasing unemployment—this is the social program of the fascist regime at a time when it is raising the cost of bread and throwing the major burden of taxation even more heavily than ever on to the consuming masses.

With such a program, fascism can claim no special credit for having maintained the standard of living of the masses. It has given no compensation for the political and economic rights it has taken from them. On the contrary, it has succeeded in burdening them more heavily than ever with the consequences of a crisis that it has proved itself unable to avert.

The record of economic achievement of fascism in Italy during the crisis sums up, therefore, to this: an unprecedented fall in foreign trade, of the same order of magnitude as that of other industrial countries; a drop in national income of the same order; a grandiose program of public works and agricultural stimulation, resulting only in smaller supplies of food at higher prices; unbalanced budgets and a weakened financial situation. All this was paid for and supported by a victorious assault against the living standards of the masses. If these are the results obtained by the oldest fascist state, whose power has been consolidating itself for over a decade, then we must conclude that from the standpoint of the mass of the population, by objective economic tests, fascism as a social system has been tried and has failed.

B. J. Field.

No Santa Claus

THE CURRENT gossip in Washington is that Mr. Roosevelt has at last made a great discovery: the discovery that there isn't any Santa Claus.

I am not sure that this gossip is correct. I am sure, however, that the President has recently had ample evidence that the theory was unsound.

Mr. Roosevelt took office in a burst of moral good will, originating with himself and directed toward the rulers of the prevailing economic organization of the United States. It is really shocking, in the correct sense of that word, to read his earliest speeches now and see how far he assumed that he would somehow be able to change the whole American landscape by appealing to people to be good. To be sure, he proposed a number of laws, most of which have now been enacted; but in nearly every case, the main reliance was upon the wholehearted coöperation of those who would be affected by these laws, in some cases very painfully affected indeed.

There was, for instance, the whole plan of the N.R.A. Business was to accept the theory of reing power and to accept the law as a self-denying ordinance. Minimum wages were written into the codes and there was an implied moral obligation to raise wages in proportion, among the great majority of the workers. The only trouble about this is that it never happened. Business never did accept the fundamental theory. General Johnson had sailing orders that prevented his writing into the codes anything to which a majority of the employers were violently opposed. The result was what everybody sees: we gave up the anti-trust law, inaugurated an orgy of price fixing and profiteering, and got in exchange just about nothing at all. The cost of living has gone up far more than individual wage earnings. Nearly everyone who had a job before the codes finds himself worse off than if the N.R.A. had never been.

Another moral attitude was represented in Section 7a. The President announced that all right-thinking men now believe in collective bargaining; and he assumed that all men think as rightly as he does himself. Yet ample evidence now exists that

UNAUTHORIZED USE OR ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still resist it, and successfully. The President's appeal just happened to be made to men who are insensible to pleadings of this type.

The agricultural policy, in its first year's application, represented another request that large sections of the population should refrain from selfish advantage for the common good. Farmers were paid to restrict their acreage and rescue the whole farming class from its plight. While they agreed legally to do this, there was no real compulsion upon them except their innate desire to obey the law. Without going into complicated details, it may be said that in essence, this scheme has not worked. The best commentary upon it is the new cotton-reduction law which substitutes compulsion for the moral appeal. Everyone expects that a similar change will eventually be made regarding the other chief crops, which have so mysteriously failed to dwindle as much as was expected.

The Securities Act is another example of a law passed in the interest of the social good, but depending in large measure upon the voluntary cooperation of the financial community. Even this law, of course, provided only the barest beginning of intelligent direction for the flow of new investment. It was aimed to help prevent actual robbery of the investor, but it did not prevent putting our new capital into socially undesirable channels, or withholding it from those in which it was needed. Yet even this minimum degree of social control has been fought unrelentingly, from first to last, by practically the entire financial community. There is some evidence that deliberate sabotage has been employed. Mr. Roosevelt's assumption that the great bankers of the country would share his desire to make impossible a repetition of our inglorious past turns out to have been pathetically naïve. He appealed to a sense of social responsibility that just didn't exist.

Similar both in its origin and results has been the fight over the Stock Exchange Bill. Here again, tremendous abuses are known and admitted by everyone—abuses that had much to do with the fever of 1929 and the pernicious anemia of 1930-34. The President evidently believed that Wall Street ought to, and therefore would, accept a reasonable curbing by law of the more outrageous abuses. Wall Street has utterly failed to do so. On the contrary, it has raised such a dust cloud of propaganda against the bill as has rarely been seen in our history.

For more than a year, the Roosevelt administration has been trying to inaugurate a program of public works with which to prime the pump of restored prosperity. One of the most important items in this program, and one that should have been by far the most valuable of all, is construction of housing for the poor. The President hoped that the real-estate men of the country would recognize the appalling conditions under which millions of Americans live today, and would cooperate in a plan that after all impinged but little upon their normal field of activity. On the contrary, the real-estate interests of America have refused to permit the rehousing of these groups for whom they themselves admittedly can do nothing. Every few weeks, a new governmental program is announced with a great fanfare of trumpets; and each promptly vanishes into the quicksands where its predecessors lie buried.

Not quite in the same category with the foregoing, but equally good evidence of the President's belief in the magic powers of some super-Santa Claus in the background, is his experiment with the value of the dollar, now definitely and finally ended. He was unwilling to put the country through the miseries of a drastic scaling down of internal debt—a process that, however painful at the time, would have left us on a firmer foundation than now exists. He was also unwilling to fight the embattled conservatives by going through with a genuine program of budgetary inflation—which, indeed, seemed to hold tremendous dangers and to offer little real hope of the redistribution of income that was his professed goal. Accordingly, he embraced a program of pure monetary voodoo, of raising the temperature by pushing up on the thermometer. He now knows, to return to my original figure, that no Santa Claus has come down this particular chimney, or will.

One further item belongs, it seems to me, in this list of the President's delusions. He recognizes, as everyone does, that there are serious conflicts of interest between the United States and Japan. He knows, too, that a race in naval armament has never in the past led to anything but war. Yet knowing this, and sincerely desiring peace, he has pushed through a program for new naval building that will cost something between $900,000,000 and $1,250,000,000 in the next seven years. It may be said that he is only trying to put himself in a strong trading position at the naval conference of 1935; that by scrapping his new ships, he can persuade Japan to scrap her ships, also, and perhaps modify her policy on the mainland of Asia. As to this, we can only say that we hope he is more correct in his dealing with the minds of the Japanese than he has been in dealing with the minds of his fellow countrymen on a majority of his chief domestic issues. For if he is wrong, the results will indeed be tragic for the world.

What I have said above is of course in no sense a reflection upon the spirit that imbues the President's personality. It is really true that he is so generous in heart, so deeply concerned for the welfare of all mankind, that he cannot conceive of other men less altruistic than himself, men who care not at all how fares the common mass of mankind if only their own nests are well feathered, snug and warm. Mr. Roosevelt's naïveté is that of a man whose own lot, on the whole, has been cast in sunny places. There is no doubt that he is disconcerted and grieved at the comparative failure of so many items on his program for remaking America. His

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disillusionment is today a matter of common report.

Meantime, however, many millions of his fellow countrymen continue to suffer acutely because of this series of situations that have got out of control. Ten million unemployed look with gaunt faces and hollow eyes to the White House whence have issued so many words of reassurance not yet translated into fact. Business is somewhat better, but no one can say that this improvement is permanent, that the N.R.A. has had anything to do with it, or that it results from anything except the pouring out of billions of dollars of federal money, chiefly for relief. It seems clear that, if he has not already done so, the President should now wholly disabuse his mind of the Santa Claus theory. He should recognize the fact that when private selfishness is asked to yield to the public interest, private selfishness always and everywhere refuses. He should determine that in so far as he wants social control he must fight for it, grimly, desperately and to the last ounce of his strength. Such measures as do not seem to him to call for this sort of sacrifice, he should drop. Kris Kringle will not help.

BRUCE BLIVEN.

China Takes to the Air

THE PICTURE of China as a maze of conflicting anarchy in which the words "government" and "governor" are the courtesy titles of individual or collected warlords is not quite so true today as it was even as recently as 1929. It is not an altogether false picture—there are a number of warlord "Governors"—but the power of Chiang Kai-shek's Nanking government is greater than ever before. The reason is not psychological; it is brutally mechanical: the airplane.

The Nine Power Treaty of 1922 guaranteeing the integrity of China and the Open Door carried an interesting rider, added formally in 1925, that was dictated probably by the immediate interests of a commerce rapidly disappearing in the constant civil wars. The Powers agreed not to sell arms of any kind, including military planes, to any organization or individual in China without the consent of the recognized, established government. This happened to be Nanking. This agreement, so far at least as it applied to planes, has been kept, not because individual companies would not have been willing to make a little money on the side but because the export of planes was forbidden by the Western Powers themselves unless the shipper possessed an import permit (*huchao*) countersigned by the "recognized government" of China: Nanking.

In violation of this agreement some few planes have been sold to other factions without Nanking's permission. But these were not essentially fighting ships and were no match for Nanking's first-class military planes bought from the United States. As a result Nanking has been quietly reaching the point where China, with her air force. That point she has not yet reached, but it is already within sight.

In other fields, too, American money has been consciously or unconsciously buttressing Nanking's power. The China Famine Relief, an American philanthropic organization, has been spending millions upon the development of roads, dams and dykes that are gradually breaking down the isolation of parts of China where formerly, secure from the power of the recognized governments, individual generals and local factions were able to conduct private governments of their own.

Not the least of these unifying forces has been the development of commercial aviation—that, too, largely an American importation. One German-owned line, the Eurasia Company, flies from Shanghai and Peking by way of Loyang and Turkestan to the Russian border. Since the occupation of Manchuria the Japanese have opened a few lines in the North. The rest of Chinese civil aviation is in the hands of the American-controlled China National Aviation Corporation, a subsidiary of the Pan-American, that flies three great trunk lines.

In recent years rebellions of ambitious generals have become less and less frequent and those that have occurred have invariably ended disastrously under the bombs and machine guns of Nanking's planes. Even the Canton government which possesses a few planes of its own, has been pressed nearer and nearer to submission by an arm that it can neither oppose nor duplicate. A few months ago it appeared on the point of capitulation and though the war has since been renewed, Nanking appears certain of eventual victory.

Though it is an important factor in asserting dominance in internal political affairs, Nanking found her air force hopelessly inadequate to cope with a foreign military threat. When the Shanghai war broke out China had hundreds of planes in service, but only about forty of them, mainly American Douglases and Corsairs, with a sprinkling of German, French and British ships, were capable of engaging in modern aerial combat.

Plane for plane, the Chinese Western-built aircraft are far superior in quality to the Japanese-built craft powered with British and American engines. Nevertheless, cooler heads in the Chinese government recognized the potential Japanese threat of a thousand or more military planes ready to take the air should China's meager force of forty-odd attempt to interfere with the Japanese air bombardment of Chapei and nearby points.

China learned a bitter lesson in the Shanghai war. Now the government is officially determined to build an air force that will be able to contend with invasion next time. In fact, it has recently announced that a fighting strength of 3,000 first-class military planes will be reached within the next three years. No doubt the announcement of this program is a long way short of realizing it and having the ships and the trained pilots ready for whatever use

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nanking has for them. None the less, the government is putting money and energy into developing as much of it as can be attained. Planes are bought as rapidly as the government's finances allow and a modern $5,000,000 airplane factory is already under construction for the government by Curtiss-Wright at Hangchow. The figures on exports of planes from the United States to China (including Hongkong) are:

	1931	1932	1933	January and February 1934
Number	42	22	122	20
Value	$989,000	277,000	1,930,000	433,000

Source: Aeronautics Trade Division, Department of Commerce.

Very few of the ships listed in this table are commercial craft; most are military planes and the rest are training ships, which are, of course, just as essential from a military view. There are, further, a number of interesting additions to make to the table. In 1930 China already possessed some forty modern ships; she has bought ships from other countries than the United States, notably bombers from Italy; finally, she has bought some fifty planes in 1934 that have not yet been shipped and so do not appear in the table. It would probably be a conservative estimate to say that Nanking has 300 modern fighting ships at her disposal. From the American side the China air trade is equally interesting. In 1933 at least 24 percent of our total exports of airplanes and air equipment went to China, a value of $2,246,000 out of a total trade of $9,227,000.

A revolutionary change is likewise being rapidly developed in personnel. Heretofore China has employed itinerant soldier-of-fortune airmen. But today, Colonel John Jouett, former commander of the Third Attack Group, United States Air Corps, and a staff of fourteen American former Air Corps pilots and mechanics are officially in charge of training an efficient Chinese air force, using equipment that is almost identical with that of the United States Air Corps.

To Japan, at any rate, this whole development of modern aviation in China has become an increasing worry. As yet it is not dangerous, but it holds a distinct threat for the future. A China unified for practical political purposes by commercial air lines, with a monopoly of military planes in the hands of Nanking, can easily develop into a China with a moderately powerful air fleet.

With Tokyo and Osaka, where the generating power for all Japanese industry is concentrated, only a few hours distant, Japan could well fear a squadron of martyr-manned bombers sneaking over from "somewhere in China" some dark night, paralyzing her whole industry and spreading death and horror before they could be downed or driven off. It is not an attractive prospect for Japan. To defend a concentrated industrial community against air attack, even a none too skillful one, is not easy. A great Russian air fleet hangs as a perpetual menace over Japan from the North. She does not want another on the West.

The Manchurian and Shanghai "incidents" Japan excused by saying she was forced to act because China had no strong central government, either willing to or able to assert its authority. For the past three years Japan has watched with growing apprehension the steady advance in influence, power and prestige of the Nanking government.

Japan is alarmed. An organized China, headed by an unfriendly strong central government, now becomes a threat to her self-declared suzerainty in the Orient. Despite her complaints and excuses for the Manchurian and Shanghai "incidents," she now finds that a *disorganized* China is more to her liking.

HARRISON FORMAN.

Kentucky Hill Dance

WE ARE having a dance at Todd's house. The couples come riding in on horseback and muleback or they come in automobiles. They bring their whiskey with them. And there is plenty of whiskey where we are having the dance. It is in a water-bucket. We can drink it from a gourd or a dipper—and from the bucket if we please to do so, like we drink water from a bucket on a hot day in June when we are chopping weeds out of the new-ground corn.

The fiddler takes a couple of big-snorts and away he goes. He starts fiddling "Birdie." It is one of the finest dance tunes in the mountains of Kentucky. And we take our partners and hit the floor. And the strong-voiced Shug Penix starts calling for the set: "Let this be 'Waltz the Hall,' boys. All set. Let's go!"

Hickory log and a poplar stump,
Hole in the floor and everybody jump.
Sash-a-way to the right and don't get wrong,
Meet your Honey and promenade around—

The heels hit the rough oak planks. The strong straight bodies of the girls gracefully swing to the rhythm of the fiddle, banjo and guitar. The feet of the men fairly knock the tune on the hardwood floor. We are all happy. And the dance goes on:

First couple out and circle four—
Right hands crossed and circle four—
Left hands crossed and circle four
And step right through the old side door.
Opposite partners swing and waltz around
Now swing your partner and waltz again—
Swing 'em right and don't get wrong
And meet your Honey and waltz her around.

Swing little Mary and Susie Ann—
Hurry up Kate don't leave your man—

The dance goes on to the beautiful rhythm of "Birdie." There is no other d[illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the hills of Kentucky. And there is no other whiskey in the hills of Kentucky like we have at this dance.

Our fiddler has passed out. Another, not half as good, takes his place. And the favorite tune of the second fiddler is "Wild Hog in the Red Brush." The dance goes on. Many of the men have begun to stagger. The fiddler is a mass of alcoholic clay piled out beside the house in the open air. Maybe he will get all straightened up by midnight and we'll be able to use him for the last half of the night. But things are looking a little dark at this dance.

I hear a fellow say: "Whiskey's that fighting kind of old rot-gut. There is hell a-brewing at this dance. Now mind what I tell you. Them Bad Burkes and Leadinghams is here tonight. They are just waiting for a chance to start the ball rolling."

The ball starts rolling. Daniel Burke hits Cy Leadingham between the eyes with a fiddle bow. "I wouldn't a-cared so much, Dan, if you'd a-hit Cy with your fist. But you damn nigh ruined my fiddle bow that I got offen Grandpa nigh two weeks afore he died." The men strike blows at each other's faces. More Leadinghams are into the fray —more Burkes step in. The fight has started. No one can stop them. No fifty can stop them. The fight has come. The licks fly.

Outside in the yard one can hear the licks struck within the giant century-old log house. One can hear the cries and the curses of the men and the finer cries of the women. One can see the tall, strong and brown-skinned mountain girls (skin made brown by working in the corn fields and the tobacco fields) come pouring out at the doors. And a voice among them is higher than the rest: "They got that old rot-gut down to Phil Conley's. I knowed what was going to happen all the time. This is the way of all our dances any more. We just can't have them for rot-gut whiskey. We can't have church. We can't have anything." And then her mother says: "Yes, it's awful bad. Used to when me and your Pap went to dances I never seed anything like this. And I've seen some pretty bad times at the old dances. I've seen the lights shot out and heard a man scream. And when the lamps were lit again a couple of men would be cut to pieces. Yes, I've seen all that in these hills. But I ain't never seed men all pile up and fight like hogs before with nary bit of sense to their fighting. Listen in there, won't you, to them screams."

The fight goes on. Men drag out of the mountain shack with busted lips, smashed noses and closed eyes. They do not know what the fight is all about. It just started.

The moon rides high in the blue sky. The stars shine down on the green fields around the shack. There is green waving corn in the moonlight. And there are huge plants of green broad-leaf tobacco in the moonlight. There are tall slender poplar trees near the house. The wind blows through the thick leaves on these poplars. It makes a rustling sound. And the bark of these poplars is gray. It looks poplar leaves in the wind is drowned by the cries of men fighting outside the house in the moonlight. They fight right over the body of the drunken fiddler and the bodies of the other drunken men.

I am one of a little line of men walking up the hill in single file. I have a friend with me and this is his first trip to Kentucky. I want him to get good old rot-gut. And I hope to myself that he gets three good drinks. That will be enough. We go upon the hill. Under some little pines we stop and Enic Blevins gets a bottle of rot-gut whiskey and a bottle of rot-gut wine. I have said I would not drink any more. But a friend is with me. I must drink with him and be sociable. I drink the wine. He drinks the whiskey. We stand under the pines. We turn the bottles up and face the stars and drink.

We all go down the hill together. We sing. And then we begin to brood about the fight between the rival families. And it rolls over in our minds. "We are cowards. What are we doing out of that fight? We ought to take sides. We must go into it. The Burkes are not anything. We'll just go down and give the Leadinghams a lift." Into the fray we go. There are enough of us to decide the fight, nine of us. We clean the Burkes out of the house. We clean it up for the Todds. We tell them to get to hell off the hill. We start the dance. We dance on till daylight.

The next morning we start to our homes. A shower of rain has fallen, and we must set some late tobacco. Though it is Sunday morning and we have danced from nine o'clock Saturday, it does not matter; tobacco-setting season does not always come. We are very sore over the fight. And we hear among the neighbors: "Pretty bad scrap at Todd's last night. It's a thousand wonders to me some of them ain't cut to pieces this morning."

JESSE STUART.

Washington Notes

Stimson Sticks—Can Roosevelt Run the Tariff?
—Objection with Bad Grace—
Still on the See-Saw

CONGRESS plods its weary way toward early June adjournment and the President's program rather bumpily progresses toward enactment. It now seems clear that practically everything he demanded will be obtained, though not all of it in the shape he most desired. Endorsement of the President's request for complete tariff-making power by the august and righteous Henry L. Stimson, Hoover's so-correct Secretary of State, seemed to assure speedy passage of that proposal, and quite cut the ground from under various Republican Senators who were prepared to go as far as a filibuster to block its enactment.

Stimson's endorsement was not really a surprise to those who know the rather close personal relationship between Mr. Roosevelt and the bright star of the Hoover Cabinet.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when the unfortunate Mr. Hoover was endeavoring to obtain coöperative action from the incoming President on war debts, currency assurances, bank crises and other mildly pressing matters, it was found easier to talk to Mr. Roosevelt through Mr. Stimson than through anyone else. Instead of bristling, as Mr. Roosevelt did when Mr. Ogden Mills was in the room, or being evasively suave and wary as he was with Mr. Hoover, when Mr. Stimson was around, the two of them, figuratively speaking, let down their hair and had a good comfortable chat. It will be recalled, too, that Mr. Roosevelt endorsed the Stimson Far East policy and gave the impression of seeing eye to eye in foreign affairs with "Our Harry," as the Hoover Secretary of State used to be referred to by the New York Republican leaders who did not particularly care for him.

Toward the last, there was reason to believe that Mr. Hoover and Mr. Mills rather thought "Our Harry" got along with the victorious Roosevelt almost too well to be altogether devoted to the aims, ideas, principles and policies of his defeated Chief. At any rate, there has always been complete personal friendliness between the Messrs. Roosevelt and Stimson, and the latter's unexpected commendation of the tariff proposal was wholly in harmony with their relationship. Of course, it is also wholly logical and consistent, since this tariff request, in its essentials, is almost identical with that urged by Mr. Hoover, favored by the Republican Senators and opposed with declamatory and collective violence by the Democratic Senators, some twenty of whom went so far as to sign an appeal to the American people, pointing out the menace to their liberties in such a proposal and calling upon them to resist.

It is one of the interesting ironies of politics that today the two parties have so completely changed positions on this issue, the Democrats now urging it as the one way to save our foreign trade and take care of our surplus production and the Republicans insisting that it is a blow to freedom and bad beyond belief. In such a situation, regardless of the merits of the question, it is rather a relief to find a man who has not shifted his position but thinks as he did a year ago. From this angle "Our Harry" is entitled to a bouquet. And if flowers are to be distributed on this ground, perhaps some should be tossed also to Mr. Robert Lincoln O'Brien, Republican head of the Tariff Board, who regards the present rate-making machinery as a joke and believes the President should be given the power he asks. Any minute now, Congress is likely to hand Roosevelt this tariff power, yet so extraordinary is the spectacle presented by the party politicians in their shift from one side to the other that it seems worth while to point out the facts before the whole business becomes blurred. It is not, I submit, one of those things calculated to revive the confidence of the American people in the intellectual integrity of their representatives in Congress.

On the assumption that the tariff-making power is as good as granted, questions arise over how effectively it can be used. On this point, the best posted men are extremely skeptical of any immediate results. Most of them think that if the President undertakes any radical changes, he will find himself subjected to very strong pressure indeed and that the alterations he will actually be able to put through will be in any event it seems agreed that from the scientific as well as the political standpoint it is better to put the responsibility on the President rather than on Congress.

Outside of Congress, the most interesting recent event here has been the meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce, under whose auspices assembled a great gathering of so-called representative business men from all parts of the country. The proceedings were not without significance. This is the same association that, under the leadership of Mr. Harriman, was in a great panic a little more than a year ago. At that time it felt and urged the desirability of governmental control and regulation of business and was, in fact, enthusiastic about the N.R.A. principle of code regulation even before the regulations took definite legislative shape. This time the members came to Washington thoroughly dissatisfied over the operation of the N.I.R.A. and exceedingly restive over the degree to which government control had been extended. They were full of complaints, criticisms and suggestions. Few desired to throw off the governmental harness, but most of them were exceedingly anxious to get rid of the curb bits, traces and bridles. In brief, they now want to be driven by kind words but no whip. It is quite a contrast. The change in attitude is simply because they have got over their fright and are beginning again to feel the beneficial effect of oats. What they seem to forget is that they have prospered pretty well under N.R.A., which has given them their opportunity to eliminate competition and pass on their increased overhead to the consumer. I can see a great deal of force in criticisms of the N.R.A. coming from squeezed consumers and the little business men who can no longer undersell their big competitors, but objection from such a group as the United States Chamber of Commerce comes with very bad grace indeed. Nor was it encouraging to note the evident effort to conciliate, placate and please on the part of the administration spokesmen who addressed the meetings.

Assurances were given, some publicly and more privately, that the President was ready to remove the brakes and that the restraints and experimentation would be reduced to a minimum. The general idea was discreetly conveyed that the trend of the administration would be toward the Right and that business could cast aside its apprehensions; there would be no further efforts to enforce unpalatable labor conditions or discouraging business restrictions.

The membership of the Chamber, intensively conservative, not to say reactionary, at heart, were in the main cheered by their Washington week and went home convinced that the Roosevelt administration was really "safe" and that the alarming reports of the pernicious influence of the liberal element were more or less unfounded. The Chamber membership is largely composed of men who want the Securities Act modified, the Stock Exchange Bill devitalized and the Wagner Labor Board measure cast into oblivion. Many of them got the idea that these desirable eventualities were soon to be expected. Of course, by the time this article is printed, they may, if the Roosevelt policy remains consistent in its inconsistencies, find that these aren't the President's plans at all.

It is certain that several of the more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authoritative White House assurance that the President has not the remotest intention of retracing his steps. On the contrary, he is reported to be determined to save the Securities Act from emasculation, to keep the reinserted Pecora-Landis teeth in the Stock Exchange Bill, and to be, in principle, behind the Wagner Bill. Further, it is said that his desire is to see a revamping of the N.R.A. specifically to compel the larger industries to live up to their new codes, which should, in his judgment, provide a far better break for the consumer, the little business man and labor. Once again each side believes the presidential heart beats soundly with it; both are equally confident that when the decisive step is taken it will be in their direction. So far as I am concerned, after having had a year's experience during which we have arrived at what is jocularly referred to as "the crossroads" or the "parting of the ways" some half-dozen times, I have about reached the conclusion that the decisive step never will be taken.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Market Regulation Goes to the President—"Less Government in Business"—Who Was the Friend of Pensions?

AFTER much confusion, the status of the Stock Exchange Regulation Bill in Washington is as follows: Almost all of the original powers that were put into the bill have been taken out of it and lodged with whatever supervisory commission is set up. The commission is vested with fairly large powers and this explains the course the fight has taken. The original sponsors of the bill lodged its administration with the Federal Trade Commission. This provoked a bitter fight by the Exchange. The president of the Exchange rushed down to Washington and proposed a separate commission. The reason for this is obvious. It is pretty well known how the Federal Trade Commission stands. It is reasonably certain that the Commission, at least for the time being, would really attempt to make the new law work. The only hope of the Exchange, therefore, was to get a new commission in the hope that it would be manned by less resolute regulators.

In this fight the Exchange has been successful before the Senate Committee. But the House bill retains the Federal Trade Commission as the regulatory body. However, it puts the regulation of margins, in so far as they are regulated, in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board. This is also a victory for the enemies of the bill.

As I write there is no doubt that both Houses will pass their respective bills, which must then go to a conference for agreement. When they do, the Federal Trade Commission will probably be ditched and a separate commission agreed on. This, then, puts the whole subject up to the President. Whether we have real stock-market regulation or not will depend on the kind of men appointed to the commission. And that is up to the President. I would like to make this warning in advance. It will not do to name just one or two good strong men and then put in [illegible] to the Exchange or just re- [illegible] nearly time the New Deal abandoned this company.

The friends of the Exchange are busy at work behind the scenes now on this vital point. They have powerful friends in Washington, friends close to the throne. But the President will make the greatest blunder of his administration if he attempts to placate these anti-social men. He has already made the error of courting the favor and support of big business men through the N.R.A. I was in Washington during the Chamber of Commerce convention, and it was perfectly plain that they are now ready to throw him down. The crowd in Wall Street will be even more realistic. They will turn on him and tear him to pieces no matter what he does.

Here is a little inside peek at what is going on in the collective skull of the Chamber of Commerce. Of course, the speeches made for public consumption mean nothing. First, the members of the Chamber think things are in a pretty shaky way and they are filled with apprehension and uncertainty about the future. Second, they plan to try to save the code feature of the N.R.A. and let everything else in it go. When the N.R.A. expires at the end of a year, they hope they can let it slide, and merely get an act permitting industry to adopt codes of fair practice.

It is generally believed that Johnson is on his way out and that W. Averell Harriman will succeed him as head of the N.R.A. Harriman, chairman of the board of the Union Pacific Railroad, a banker, son of the late E. H. Harriman, the inheritor of his position and influence, would make the ideal Chamber of Commerce head of N.R.A. First of all, he believes in the precious scheme of self-rule in industry. Last week he made a speech to trade associations in which he forecast that we were moving toward "real" self-rule in industry, with the intimation that government regimentation would go out the window. Can the Chamber of Commerce get away with that? They have gotten away with a good deal under the New Deal. But the remorseless course of events in the coming year may have some rather unfortunate effects on the success of their present schemes.

One of the things that amazes and saddens the liberal groups in Washington is the President's apparent lack of interest in old-age pensions. As Governor of New York, inheriting the liberal social-welfare tradition of Al Smith, Mr. Roosevelt put over an old-age-pension law. But he has been in office now for fourteen months and has not chirped on this subject, and this in spite of the fact that he has been importuned to do so. Is this another consequence of his close relationship with the gentlemen who constitute Mr. Dan Roper's Committee of Forty-One? Mr. Swope, representing the idea of self-rule in business—which means rule of employers over business, employees, customers, everybody—proposes to turn the subject of unemployment insurance and old-age pensions over to the trade associations. Can it be that the President now leans toward committing the subject of old-age pensions to business? It is known that he has been urged to put the administration behind this reform and that he has refused to do so. America, Japan and India are the only large nations in the world that have not some form of old-age pensions. It is pretty

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the Labor Front

Harriman's Higher Arithmetic—Relief Goes on Rising—Plowing the Tenant Farmer Under —Johnson Dislikes Policemen

THE NEATEST juggling of unemployment figures since the days of that masterful prestidigitator, Dr. Julius Klein—President Hoover's chief assistant in optimism—was performed last week by Mr. Henry I. Harriman, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Speaking before the chamber assembled in Washington, he remarked that today's "most hopeful statistical figure is that of unemployment." A year ago, he said, the number of unemployed was 13,000,000, while "today it is not even 7,000,000, and from this number must be deducted about 3,000,000 who are normally out of work, leaving the present excess of the unemployed around 4,000,000 of our people."

Taking Mr. Harriman's last figure first, one must give him credit for originality in arriving at this answer. No one, I believe, has ever approached the problem from quite this angle: that, since 3,000,000 men and women are normally unemployed, they need not be considered at all and can simply be dismissed like the zeros following a decimal point.

Mr. Harriman's estimate of a total of 7,000,000 out of work is another matter. No one knows precisely how many unemployed there are—not even the government. Anyone is free to make his own guess. But Mr. Harriman, it would seem, has abused the privilege. For a number of careful estimates have been made by independent organizations and, though all of them agree roughly with his estimate of 13,000,000 unemployed a year ago, none of them comes anywhere near supporting his figure of 7,000,000 today. The National Industrial Conference Board, the most conservative of statistical organizations, reports 8,021,000 without work in March. But it counts as employed several million workers on the P.W.A., so its figure for workers not employed by private business would probably be close to 10,000,000. This is not far from the estimate of the American Federation of Labor, which publishes the best monthly figure available. The Federation's figure for March of last year was 13,689,000 out of work and for this March, 10,905,000.

Moreover, the Federation in its latest report goes on to say that these estimates do not tell the whole story. The figures on relief, it states, "record no progress whatever in eliminating destitution." Indeed, it appears that the number of families in need of relief, instead of declining as men go back to work, has in recent months actually been on the increase. These facts give point to the renewed effort, now being made in Congress, for the enactment of a compulsory thirty-hour-week bill, which, it is hoped, would force industry to take on 3,000,000 more men.

Another phase of the unemployment problem is presented in Dr. Calvin B. Hoover's report on "Human Problems in Acreage Reduction in the South," made at the request of Secretary of Agriculture Wallace. Dr. Hoover reports that during the last five years the number of former tenant farmers now without means of livelihood has been growing. The government's acreage-reduction program, he states, "creates a motive for reducing the number of tenants on farms." The acreage-reduction contracts contain provisions designed to prevent this, but "the system of enforcement has been inadequate." He also reports that tenants have not been receiving their share of the benefit payments by the government for acreage reduction. Frequently the charitableness of the landlord determines whether the tenant receives anything at all. The families of such workers are now living in "appalling" conditions with standards "shockingly" low. As a result of the survey, the A.A.A. is reported to be considering ways of forcing the Southern landlords to comply with the terms of their cotton contracts.

The National Labor Board has just issued, in book form, the decisions it has handed down in labor disputes, and this has been sent to all Regional Labor Boards and industrial-relations boards—for their "information and guidance." The principles of industrial relations to which it has adhered in making these decisions have been summarized by Milton J. Handler, general counsel to the Board. For the benefit of those who may not be quite clear in their own minds as to what the Board has stood for, the more important principles are as follows:

> The Board has ruled that organization is a matter exclusively within the control of the employees. It has counseled a "hands off" policy on the part of employers.
>
> The employees may select any representatives they choose as their agents for collective bargaining. The employer may not restrict their right of free choice in any way . . . employees may select a union.
>
> The representatives selected by the majority of the employees within a given plant or department are the sole collective-bargaining agency for the plant or department.
>
> The Board has ruled that the discharge of employees because of their union activity is contrary to Section 7a, and has condemned interference with the rights guaranteed in Section 7a.
>
> The Board has held that the manner of conducting an election [to determine the authorized representatives of employees] is entirely within the discretion of the employees, and that the employer in no way can interfere with the conduct of the election.
>
> The Board has condemned the initiation of a company union by an employer and the participation by him in its affairs, where such initiation and participation has, in effect, been an interference with the employees' self-organization, or resulted, in fact, in the domination of the organization by the employer, and where the employees have not clearly consented thereto.

With these principles there can be no quarrel; they are, in Senator Wagner's words, "a sound contribution to the formulation of a national labor policy." What is missing, however, and painfully missing, is any suggestion as to how the principles, once they have been invoked, can be enforced. The decisions are meaningless so long as they represent nothing more than expressions of opinion. Certainly it is apparent by now that General Motors, Harriman Hosiery, Budd Manufacturing, Weirton Steel and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the exception of Weirton, that is what the Board, the N.R.A. and the President have relied upon. And if General Johnson's statement to the Newspaper Editors' Society a week ago is indicative, it is what the administration will continue to rely upon. "You can't enforce this act with policemen and penalties," he said. "This act will go by popular approval or it won't go at all." That, it must be confessed, explains a great deal as to why the N.R.A. has failed to support labor in its effort to organize. If genuine collective bargaining in the steel and automobile industries must wait upon popular acclaim from the industrialists, it has as much chance as the proverbial snowball in hell.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD.

It's Up to the Kiddies

MY MODEST system of cataloguing has got to be extended, I see, because it is impossible to sit through a film like "Stand Up and Cheer," and then just file it away in the ordinary drawer labeled Stinkers. This one is extra, it is super, and more, it butters itself very thickly with the most obvious sort of topical significance. In body it is half on the vaudeville side and half in the lap of whatever maternal instinct it is that responds with little cries to the spectacle of diapers in art. But like all musicals it also has a story, and that is where the significance comes in. From the story "suggested" by Will Rogers and Philip Klein it seems there was once a depression, no matter where. Well, the President of the country where this depression was heard about it and decided not to have any. So he called to him and appointed as Secretary of Amusement some flash promoter from the Broadway district, the idea being that any people as ruggedly fibered as that country's citizens could laugh off a depression if they just got to feeling snickery about it. So the promoter (Warner Baxter) appointed an office building and divided his time among his Director of the Kiddies' Hour (Miss Madge Evans), wholesale auditions and a coast-to-coast trunk line: Yeah, yeah. Twenty male choirs and a gross of trombones. Yeah. . . . Then you begin to see the country singing—sweatshop women, cops, kiddies, brakemen, typists—all singing something about "If I can smile, why can't you?" So pretty soon everybody was smiling and everything. But some bankers and reformers didn't like this smiling promoter, and started a whispering campaign to disconcert him. However, he kept ordering trombones and stroking Miss Evans and then, flash, he quit, and then, flash, he didn't quit after all, and then, flush, he decided to purge the system of such extravagances as Departments of Kiddies' Hours—and then, pitter patter of little feet, what should come but word that the kiddies had made the country laugh and the depression was over. And the way this last was made clear to the reapers and the sowers, to the drivers of trucks and sweatshop help, was by a horseman larruping along at an altitude of about 2,000 feet, looking from his mount and coattails like George Washington and from his aerial Americanism like Charles A. Lindbergh, but from his face, which showed finally in the close-up, exceedingly like a waffle—tearing up the sky until, in a state of complete suspension, he led all the country (which had by now assemmunity song composed expressly for the occasion with all three of its notes entirely new and different. "We're Out of the Red," the song with notes, is the work of the man who composed "Brother, Can You Spare a Dime." . . . And as this later effort seemed to relieve the people of that country immensely, I suggest that those several million Americans to whom its fine optimism is directed be if possible a little ruggeder, and hock their relief tickets or panhandle some dimes, and go stand up and hear it.

OTIS C. FERGUSON.

CORRESPONDENCE

A Child Labor Plot?

SIR: The National Child Labor Committee strongly disapproves of the Rich Federal Child Labor Bill (H.R. 6184) now in the Labor Committee of the House of Representatives, and will oppose this measure if it should be reported out.

The Rich Bill prohibits the employment, during vacation periods, of any person under eighteen years except children fourteen years and over; it applies to every person in the United States who hires another person for any purpose or for any length of time; it sets up a uniform minimum wage for all employees in all types of work; and carries unworkable provisions for administration and enforcement by the United States Secretary of Labor.

Such standards and requirements are wholly unreasonable and palpably absurd. If the bill had been framed by the opponents of the Federal Child Labor Amendment it could not have been better designed to alienate support from that measure by giving the impression that those interested in protecting children would advocate such ridiculous legislation. None of the national agencies interested in child-labor legislation was consulted in the drafting of the bill and they did not know that it was to be introduced.

Those opposing the Amendment have commented widely upon the Rich Bill, stating that it was introduced in anticipation of ratification of the Federal Child Labor Amendment and implying that it has the approval of the proponents of the Amendment. The National Child Labor Committee, however, believes that the bill, instead of illustrating the type of legislation desired by the proponents of the Amendment, seems rather to illustrate the tactics of the opposition to the Amendment.

COURTENAY DINWIDDIE, General Secretary,
New York City. National Child Labor Committee.

The Libraries Endangered

SIR: I hope you will call the active attention of your readers to the plight of the public libraries. The fact that good books were free and accessible to millions of Americans has been one of the reasons for hope that an important minority of Americans might eventually learn to *read* (I use the word in contradistinction from whatever it is that people do when they submit to the blandishments of newspaper, magazine and cheap fiction). During the first quarter of the twentieth century this hope began to be realized. The minority who read good books grew from an infinitesimal number to be at least the nucleus of an intelligent reading public; the number of good books published grew also; and the chief source of their distribution became the public libraries of the country.

The depression has stimulated both the number of readers and the small group of serious readers. Since 1929, four or five million registered borrowers have been added to the library lists, and the classification of titles borrowed shows increased percentages for works on sociology, political and economic science, philosophy, psychology, belles lettres, etc., in some cases of over 100 percent. During this period of depression, appropriations have been savagely slashed. Many important libraries have bought practically no new books for several years. And the proportion of tax funds devoted to libraries at its highest, was never more than 1.4 cents

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is obvious that we have here one of the most sinister symptoms of the breakdown of our system. With increased leisure and increased bewilderment, our people are turning to serious books for the intellectual, emotional and spiritual nurture of good books. And the troglodytes who run our cities select this time to save on the *penny* which public opinion has forced them to bestow on books. . . .

The battle to save the libraries is, I believe, a major one in our war for social reconstruction. All good citizens should, and can, join in it. They can make investigations of their municipal budgets; they can exert pressure on their local legislators. They can insist that in the common need for economy, an institution that does so much for the dawning intelligence of the nation shall not be sacrificed, but strengthened.

New York City. WALDO FRANK.

Interesting Data from Mr. Knopf

SIR: I think it was an awfully good idea of Mr. Cowley's to start that series of "Good Books That Almost Nobody Has Read." And I feel sure that you will understand that it is only with a desire to help you and your readers to a knowledge of facts of the kind that people connected with the book business seem constitutionally reluctant to give out, that I am writing this letter concerning only the titles listed in your issue of April 18 which have been published by me.

Of "The Human Body," by Logan Clendenning, we have sold through March 31, 1934, 27,194 copies. Garden City Publishing company have sold approximately 139,833 copies of the one-dollar edition. You could hardly, therefore, with fairness, call that a book "that almost nobody has read."

Of Dr. Clendenning's "The Care and Feeding of Adults" we have sold 4,123 copies, and of his "Behind the Doctor," published only last October, 7,514 copies.

"Saturday Night at the Greyhound" was, in truth, a regrettable failure. Only 1,268 copies were sold at the original published price of $2 and 115 copies were remaindered.

Of Stevens' "Harmonium," in its definitive edition, we have sold thus far 887 copies.

Scott Fitzgerald's mind was by no means wandering when he referred to "Spring Flight." This novel by a Detroit newspaper man, Lee J. Smitts, we published in March, 1925, and its failure so discouraged Smitts that I don't think he has attempted to publish a book since. "Spring Flight" struck all of us in my organization at the time as an uncommonly brilliant first novel, but its sale only reached 3,244 (not so bad, really, for a first novel), and after a few years it passed out of print.

Raoul Whitfield writes boys' books as well as detective stories, and "Danger Circus," which you described as his most recent in the latter category, is actually his latest story for boys. His last detective story was "'The Virgin' Kills."

Of von Unruh's "The Way of Sacrifice" we sold only 1,760 copies and twenty-one copies of the one-dollar edition.

Neumann's "The Devil" sold 9,008 copies and was followed by a sale of 1,346 copies by Grosset and Dunlap in their reprint edition.

Kafka's "The Castle" is one of my really inglorious failures. It is, as Conrad Aiken says, a masterpiece. But in the original edition it sold only 715 copies, and since January 3, 1933, we have been offering it at the reasonable price of $1 and only 120 copies have been purchased.

New York City. ALFRED A. KNOPF.

Wall Street, Fascism and Mr. Schlink

SIR: I am a traveling man (forty years traveling in the Western states). I have just read the letter, "The New Republic and the New Deal" [The New Republic, April 25], by F. J. Schlink and others. If this gentleman will take the trouble to read the papers, he will discover that Wall Street controls 80 percent of the press and magazines, and they all hate Mr. Roosevelt as much or more than he does. I did not vote for Roosevelt, as I was positive he would be crucified by the very people he is fighting for. The trouble with [illegible] can't get just what they think is right, they will go back to Wall Street.

I would like to ask Mr. Schlink if the New Deal is all wrong, why do Wall Street and its controlled press fight it? In my travels I find practically all "big business," stock-market operators, radicals, Socialists and Communists, are against Roosevelt, but the middle classes are for him. They have the intelligence to recognize the different elements he has to fight and to realize that he has to compromise and do the best he can. But Wall Street doesn't need Mr. Schlink and his kind, as it has power enough to get back in 1936. And, rest assured, it will be the Mr. Schlinks who will put it back.

History shows that the so-called common people always have, and always will, bite the hand that feeds them. I feel mighty sorry for President Roosevelt, but he will find that the common people are his worst enemies. I traveled long enough to know something about the so-called common people. I have recently spent several months in Europe. This country will either have Wall Street or Fascism, and personally I prefer Fascism to Wall Street. However, Franklin D. Roosevelt will be recorded in history as our greatest President.

New York City. WILLIAM R. GRAYSON.

Stern Named by Error

SIR: I notice in your issue of April 25, in an article entitled "Behind Doctor Wirt," that I am listed as a "founder" of the Committee for the Nation.

A national closed-bank depositors' committee was formed in my office at The Philadelphia Record early last year. I never considered myself a member of that committee, although I helped to get it organized.

Later, the Committee for the Nation tried to take it over. As I remember, there was a split-up, but as I never attended any of the meetings, and was never personally active in the committee, I did not keep in close touch with the controversy.

My name was used in connection with that organization by error. I have made it a rule never to allow my name to be used in anything in which I am not personally active.

New York City. J. DAVID STERN.

Extracts from Letters

THE American Radio Telegraphists' Association, through its president, Hoyt S. Haddock, writes us that "the Radio Operators on the ships of the American Merchant Lines are on strike against extraordinarily vicious working conditions. The Radio Operators are now compelled to work continuous shifts of six hours on and six off—twelve hours out of twenty-four—eighty-four hours a week of nerve-racking, intensive work; work often involving the safety of ship, cargo, crew and passengers. For this they receive a wage which, reckoned in hourly pay, is less than that of the oilers or stewards on the same ships."

Something reminiscent of the old interlocking "red directorates" that used to link up Lenin and Thomas W. Lamont comes to hand in a letter from J. E. Brown of Brooklyn. "You might add," he writes, "a few paragraphs to the article 'Behind Doctor Wirt' [The New Republic, April 25]. The lawyer appearing for the Doctor at the committee hearings was ex-Senator Reed of Missouri. As the press reported, he had been engaged and paid for by Mr. Henry Pope of Chicago, president of the Bear Brand Hosiery Company, and a trustee of the Warm Springs Foundation."

"Your editorial [The New Republic, April 25] on the proposed Child Labor Amendment," writes Francis L. Burke of Concord, New Hampshire, "is distinctly unfair to Catholic opinion. The Catholic Church is not opposed to the proposed amendment. Some Catholics are and a great many are not. Consider Fathers John A. Ryan and Francis Haas, both of whom are responsible leaders in Catholic social education in this country, who have both appeared before congressional committees in favor of the amendment. Other Catholics have been outspoken in favor of the amendment

LICENSED TO OCLC-CSG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Lady from the Sea

The Lady from the Sea, by Henrik Ibsen. Little Theatre, May 1, 1934.

THERE are many interesting sides to the reappearance of this Ibsen play that a brief review can only indicate. For our American theatre the fact that Duse, on her return to the stage, chose it for her opening here, in 1923, has led to many interpretations. But the main truth is, as she herself told me, that the choice was based on two things. In the first place, in Vienna, her entrance had aroused such a storm of applause that the play from that on was wrecked of any meaning. I am not sure what the play was—"Cosí Sia," I think—but at any rate it was one in which she entered well after the beginning of the piece, and after her entrance there was no longer anything save Duse herself. To avoid this disruption caused by so late an entrance, and at the same time to find a piece in which her age—sixty-five, and a soul elevated without a girl's complexion and a lifted face—should not matter, Duse lighted on "The Lady from the Sea." It is thus brought out that she regarded Ibsen's play as unrealistic. If she could have advised Ibsen himself, the play would have benefited; for despite his moral power and expert technique, Ibsen remained parochial in taste and reiteration while Duse belonged to civilized time. But taking "The Lady from the Sea" as unrealistic, she saw Ellida as a woman without age or place. Duse played the role as a dream. To her Ellida had only the reality of the ideal.

This detail is an interesting comment on the drama that Mr. Zatkin produces at the Little Theatre. Taking "The Lady from the Sea" as it reads in the standard translation, I have always found it muddled and tedious. It is easy to imagine how flattened a mind like Duse's, cultivated on Donatello or Dante or the simple and austere Franciscan and on great music, could have been with many of those platitudes about freedom, responsibility, soul, ideals, et cetera, with which Ibsen larded—lard sounds too rich here—this semi-symbolical drama. Norwegians have told me—in Ibsen's own town, too, of Oslo—that if I could read him in his own language, I would find some of the needed glamor and vibration, the pitch and extension.

It is interesting to see the direction taken by Mr. Zatkin's production. There is not the dream, or if you like vagary, of the Duse mood. The general tendency is toward lessening the symbolistic contraptions of Ibsen's procedure and cleaning the play down to a certain intelligible realism. All this is in Ibsen perfectly enough. He knew what his play meant. But the play has suffered from the fact that it flopped between symbolism and science.

Taking the Ibsen play thus, however, requires a stronger accentuation than is given in the present performance. Mr. Moffat Johnston, for example, plays, as he always does, intelligently, and with a distinct breeding, which by some means he has been able to retain without disaster. But in an intelligible scheme such as this for "The Lady from the Sea," the more or less scientific comprehension possessed by Ellida's husband must be stressed, so that what he brings to her as support at the very last may count more definitely. Ellida herself needs from Miss Mary Hone, a continuous absorption. Nobody could tell another how this might be managed; but we can at least say that it proceeds from within, and that the full and abiding sense of the image possessing the character needs to be the main thing created. The image in this case Ibsen has found; it is the freedom of choice, the sea, the stranger, the haunting love. Before Ibsen himself gets through with this image he has belabored it into the tedious. In this performance of Miss Hone's the cleaning out of banal lines has helped greatly. Nevertheless, Miss Hone in her performance should permit herself more of the glamor and release possible to her temperament, technique and physical equipment, remembering that some of this image in Ellida's mind was that which in both the sea and the stranger is haunting, echoed, and beautifully felt.

As a whole Mr. Houseman's directing was easy, graceful and right. There was no high-horse Stonehenging about the scene, and there was in general a simplicity and freshness of movement and position. It may have been that the slant contrived for the stage by Mr. Oenslager prevented another arrangement; but to make the Stranger enter as directly as Mr. Wilenchick entered, merely walking on from the wings, was a mistake on Mr. Houseman's part. Ibsen has the Stranger appear through the fence palings, outside the enclosure, then at one time on the inside of the fence, at another jumping over it before he vanishes. The more one studies the play the more one sees that, as in most Ibsen stage directions, he is final and right, and unwisely departed from. But Ibsen-directing like Mr. Houseman's, without cudgels and texts, is a promising sign.

Mr. Oenslager's settings, except for the first, which, also, was badly lighted, were one of the triumphs of the season. They were carried through with great simplicity of means and with a curiously dramatic instinct to the play's demands. The garden scene with the distant mountains and the near rushes of the pool was a revelation in what out-of-doors may be. It is impossible to describe, but such a magazine as Theatre Arts will no doubt record it in the photographic notations that alone preserve it.

I was struck, watching "The Lady from the Sea," as I have often been in Ibsen, with the essential barbarism of the whole of it. Passions, ideals, affections, memories and personal character are all here seen in a vacuum, as it were; personality is seen isolated, as if there were no such things as the bonds of the individual to a society or a set of social relationships. This vast absorption with the individual by the minute, without any full scope, by the hour, of the individual-society problem, is at the bottom of both of Ibsen's kind of seriousness and Ibsen's failure in proportion and tone and civilized implication. The cerebral action in him appears too often to come through the viscera rather than in the light of abstractions and clarities; and though this sounds like the description of a German tenor, it is really only a statement of provincial earnestness minus the beneficence and easy peril of enlightened tradition. People really interested in Ibsen could scarcely excuse themselves from seeing this Ibsen production. It lacks a powerful single temperament in the company to put it through; but it is far ahead of most Ibsen productions that America has seen, in better taste generally, and more evenly distributed in its quality.

LIBERED.CUNZ.COM
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

The Man of Feeling

> It is the general notion of "thinking" that I would challenge. . . . We talk as if thought was precise and emotion was vague. In reality there is precise emotion. . . . What every poet starts from is his own emotions.

I QUOTE the above observations from T. S. Eliot's essay on Shakespeare for several reasons: first, because they are more acute than any that appear in the two books[1] before me; second, because I think they reveal a premise on which all of Eliot's writing is based; and third, because I am certain, now more than ever before, that the popular conception of him as an "intellectual" is largely false.

Perhaps no other poet since Baudelaire has thrived so well upon critical abuse as T. S. Eliot: from the very start of his career, each step that he has taken has been followed by quick dissent on the part of friends and enemies. Among the most frequent of the charges brought against him has been the charge of excessive "intellectuality," supposedly a fatal accusation against a poet, one that condemns him as a cold-blooded monster, or still worse as an actor incapable of arousing in himself the emotions that are genuinely his own. The real trouble, I think, has always been quite the opposite. The fine instrument, discernible in his poetry as well as in his prose and so often referred to as his "mind," is in reality that rare thing called "imagination." Behind it lies a surplus rather than a lack of undefined emotion. I believe that he, more than any other single figure in our time, deserves belated recognition as the twentieth-century Man of Feeling.

To me it is now clear that this Man of Feeling is mistaken by the public for, and mistakes himself for, a *public* creature, and that he is, moreover, embroiled in a three-cornered quarrel among the poet, his ideal world and the necessities of the lecture platform.

Today we have his two books: "After Strange Gods," subtitled "A Primer of Modern Heresy," a curious document that has already performed its services as a series of lectures at the University of Virginia; and "The Uses of Poetry," the Charles Eliot Norton lectures delivered at Harvard during the winter of 1932-33. If we are to trust the introductions to both books, Eliot is not unaware that the lectures are loosely phrased and written for the ear rather than the more careful analysis of the eye. They presuppose a number of beliefs held by one who lacks the time to explain his development toward a given point. This person is in the singular position of a man who invites a tabloid reporter to his home, offers the young man a chair and then proceeds to entertain him with intimate confidences. As the interview draws to a close, and the reporter is about to leave the room, he is warned that the "story," interesting as it may be, is not for publication and this point only remains clear: that such a revelation would be a breach of verbal contract and the lecturer would be made the victim of a cad.

Apparently we are to hear these remarks as tentative proposals toward critical convictions, but the convictions themselves are to be taken for granted or withheld from public view; we are kept in suspense waiting for a final word and perhaps the entire set of lectures is dependent upon a *single* word, or a last moment of revelation before utter darkness. The whole world—shall I say?—is to be relaxed in some suspended flux of "feeling," where the precise emotion must be defined before the act and where the thought processes must be retarded until some distant moment after the event. This is, I think, the ideal world that Eliot attempts to realize as an environment for his public appearances.

Such a world is hinted at when he says in "After Strange Gods" that one's prose reflections "may be legitimately occupied with ideals, whereas in the writing of verse one can deal only with actuality." Meanwhile, in discussing the uses of poetry there is time for wit and incidental speculation, "time yet for a hundred indecisions." In his Harvard lectures, for example, there is a shrewd commentary on the uses of "comic relief" in dramatic poetry—and on one use in particular, which may be traced back to the nature of a human audience whose need for it always "springs from a lack of the capacity for concentration." This observation is put into practice by Eliot himself in discussing Coleridge; and note here the whiplash of wit that brings the statement to a close:

> . . . he was condemned to know that the little poetry he had written was worth more than all he could do with the rest of his life. The author of "Biographia Literaria" was already a ruined man. Sometimes, however, to be a "ruined man" is itself a vocation.

In attacking Matthew Arnold on several sides at once, and principally because of "the deplorable moral and religious effects of confusing poetry and morals in the attempt to find a substitute for religious faith," Eliot approximates a definition of the particular kind of poetry he himself has written:

> We mean all sorts of things, I know, by Beauty. But the essential advantage for a poet is not to have a beautiful world with which to deal: it is to be able to see beneath both beauty and ugliness; to see the boredom, and the horror, and the glory.

The acceptance of this definition rests upon an emotional response to the situation that is created here by Eliot; one begins to foresee again a need for "comic relief" and again the need is quietly satisfied by his farewell to Arnold:

> Perhaps, looking inward and finding how little he had to support him, looking outward on a state of society and its tendencies, he was somewhat disturbed. He had no real serenity, only an impeccable demeanor.

At this point the public Eliot emerges; we recognize the so-called "split" in Eliot's literary personality which has led him to that extraordinary coupling of "prose" with "ideals" and "poetry" with "actuality." This inconsistency, which he so freely admits, is, I think, as unreal as the ideal environment that he conceives as a setting for his lectures. The actual "split," I think, springs from another source and has little to do with the obvious difference in the states of

[1] The Uses of Poetry, by T. S. Eliot. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press. 149 pages. $2.
After Strange Gods, by T. S. Eliot. [illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that Eliot cannot reconcile—nor will he ever, I think, bridge this gap successfully—is the real difference that exists between the poet, who from his private hell conceived "Prufrock," "The Waste Land," "Ash Wednesday," and that other person who owes his very existence to the poet, a public figure. The second person, beyond the fact that he would be quite unknown but for the poet's genius, is the result of an ironic accident. He grew to full size with a reversal of the critical abuse that made "Prufrock" and "The Waste Land" notorious and he became, like those newsreels of Hemingway fishing in Florida waters, a symbol of the post-war expatriated American. What he wore and how he dressed, his politics and personal religion, became a matter of public interest. It was he who in 1928 announced himself as possessing a point of view so often recited in subsequent essays on Eliot that it is quite unnecessary for me to repeat it here.

In "After Strange Gods," it is clear that the reception given this "summary declaration of faith" still haunts the uneasy composite of poet and public figure that Eliot has become. He now believes that the statement was "injudicious" and sees the danger of suggesting to outsiders that the Faith is a political principle or a literary fashion, and the sum of all a dramatic posture. But having once started on the road toward making his private convictions public, he finds it difficult to stop. He veers, as any Man of Feeling might, from too great reticence into intimate confidence, from the extremes of caution into serious tactlessness, until at last we hear him saying to a Southern audience: "What is still more important is unity of religious background; and reasons of race and religion combine to make any large number of free-thinking Jews undesirable."

The public figure is then revealed as an unhappy, persecuted, lonely man, an American born in St. Louis, of New England education and heritage, who has lived as an expatriate in London for a number of post-war years and has now fallen naïvely into the same trap that is set for any visitor who steps upon an American lecture platform. I know of nothing so disastrous since the arrival and unregretted departure from these shores of Count Hermann von Keyserling. There seems to be something fatal in the calm worship that an American audience bestows upon its idols—a truth, an "actuality" which the poet Eliot should have perceived at once and noted with the irony that had served him so well in "Prufrock." There can be no doubt of the sincerity that prompted his remarks on heresy and orthodoxy, of his belief in the hellfires waiting for D. H. Lawrence and Ezra Pound and even strong-willed Irving Babbitt. And to this company (not without regret) he adds Confucius, John Dewey and I. A. Richards. All, all, go down with Shelley and the rest, until the public remains of Eliot are left talking to the little band of contributors to a symposium called "I'll Take My Stand."

All this, of course, is scarcely the result of "intellectualizing" his position, or even exerting to the best advantage his sensitive critical instrument to the times. By this I mean that the larger problems of "faith" are ignored in favor of justifying a personal situation. His private hell, his fear of being misunderstood, is all too evident. His sense of personal salvation cannot, naturally enough, gratify a demand for public action. Nor does his sense of public "right" and "wrong" condone a course of conduct that allows him the freedom to walk alone. Loneliness is therefore stripped of all its pretensions to glory and horror and martyrdom (this last was the role of Baudelaire) that he

There is nothing, I think, in modern literature that exposes at such length the emotional temper of an individual dilemma as these two documents of a year's visit in America. "Feeling" and the precision of emotional expression that Eliot so frankly admires in Shakespeare is here produced in liberal measure, yet it refuses to extend toward the necessary intellectual formulation that he observes in Machiavelli and in Dante. The public figure of the poet looms too large; the *Paradiso* is all too distant and the hell too near. Will the fact that the Virginia lectures were first published in Seward Collins' "American Review" align Eliot irrevocably with our Southern Agrarians? I think not. He will again split off into a singular position where he will be heard with greater authority, but will command less influence. It will be a loneliness comparable to that which is now facing F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemingway and Glenway Wescott.

HORACE GREGORY.

The Secret International

Iron, Blood and Profits: An Exposure of the World-wide Munitions Racket, by George Seldes. New York: Harper and Brothers. 397 pages. $2.50.

IN MUCKRAKING the secret international of arms makers, George Seldes has his ups and downs. "Iron, Blood and Profits" is redundant, disorganized and oversimplified, but it is written with infectious gusto and contains many facts that should help the Nye Committee's investigation. Mr. Seldes lays the whole blame for war on fifty armament barons in different countries, and begins by showing how these gentlemen have promoted and prolonged every recent conflict, notably the World War. The familiar history of Zaharoff, Krupp, Vickers, Schneider, Morgan and Company, has been more succinctly told, but Mr. Seldes is the first American writer to present two other sensational stories from Europe. One of these has to do with the Anglo-Franco-German conspiracy to attack the Soviet Union; the other describes the part that the British Secret Service seems to have played, via Zaharoff, in the deaths of Albert Loewenstein and Prince Radziwill, which led to the smashing of the European steel cartel in 1927.

"Blood, Iron and Profits" makes a better case against the armament industry of Europe as the chief corrupter of public opinion than it does against our own arms makers. In the United States the munitions lobby has so much competition from the public utilities, the veterans, the Stock Exchange and the oil interests that it does not stand out from its competitors in corruption—indeed, the same men who are lobbying for the Vinson Naval Bill one week may be lobbying against the Securities Act the next. Furthermore, certain sections of the press do not need to be corrupted: Hearst and Pulitzer preached war against Spain solely in order to sell newspapers. But Mr. Seldes' next-to-last chapter on the new naval race shows that the same sinister forces that have long dominated Europe may triumph unless the Nye investigation checks their progress. Nor is it necessary wholly to concur in his concentrated hatred of the munitions industry in order to share his fear of the future. Fascist tendencies that used to be thought peculiar to Europe are already spreading to the United States and will presently be followed by the armament octopus that supports fascism everywhere. "Iron, Blood and Profits," with its complete bibliography and sixteen documentary appendices, is a blow in a good cause.

QUINCY HOWE.

LICENSED TO GNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The World We Live In

The Land of Plenty, by Robert Cantwell. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. $2.50.

IF A VISITOR from Mars or Moscow, puzzled by the spineless confusion of everything he ran into in the United States in these years, wanted to get an idea of the show as a whole, I can't imagine a better book to put into his hands than Robert Cantwell's second novel, "The Land of Plenty." The book is written with a deadly devastating accuracy that takes the heart out of you, but when you finish it you know more than you did when you began it. It's extraordinary how much the book covers. The method of covering the whole show is to take a very small part of the show in a factory for lumber products and builders' supplies in a town on the Pacific slope and to describe minutely two incidents and the people involved in them. The first incident is the accidental shutting off of light and power when the night shift is working on a rush order the night before the Fourth of July. The second incident is the equally accidental seizure of the plant by the picket line in the strike that results from the confusion of the shutdown. The word accidental is not quite right here, because both accidents are sudden overturns of the balance of forces of which the structure of the book is made up. But after all that's what accidents are.

"Laugh and Lie Down," which seemed to me an excellent novel, was marred by a curious dead veil that hung over it, like the pall of smoke from the forest fires over his town that Robert Cantwell is so fond of describing. It was original, accurate, direct, but somehow the full implications of the story did not quite come through. "The Land of Plenty," in spite of the moments when the story seems lost in the actual confusions and uncertainties of our lives, comes through with terrific force. The thing is that the invention of a new way of looking at the world about us, a new and unique imaginative classification of the hodgepodge of consciousness, which is what first-rate writing has got to be, is not attained in a couple of years. Original stuff is not easy to write and often at first it's not easy to read. Original writing is discovery, but the balance between discovery and understanding has got to be maintained. If the writer goes too far toward discovery, nobody can read him. If he goes too far toward understanding, all he does is ring up on the cash register of the magazines the current clichés and the slogans of the day. The writer has to be continually transforming his tools while he's using them. It's natural enough that, just as in prizefighting and in trapeze work in the circus, it is the immediate meretricious effects and not the exhibitions of science that get the big hand.

"The Land of Plenty" is full of genuine, unshowy science. To get the difference between imaginative creation and successful journalism, all you have to do is to compare it with a work of clever reporting like "I Went to Pit College." "The Land of Plenty" really molds your perceptions and leaves them different from what they were when you began it; when you have read it you have undergone the town and the forest fires, the noise and sweat and grease of the big plant on the mud flats, the feel of the dirty overalls and the tremor of the panels going under the saws, the slimy rocks round the piling at low tide, the uselessness of the outworn equipment of Fourth of July, State College, Saturday Evening Post ideas with which the bosses, the foremen and the workingmen are trying to cope run by. Reading "I Went to Pit College" leaves you as far away from the miners it describes as you are from a bum you've felt sorry for and slipped a nickel to; "The Land of Plenty" puts you right in the shoes of the men and women who work in and exploit the lumber business. Some of it is not too hellishly agreeable to go through, but then discovery is not an entirely agreeable pastime. The reader is helped by some fine moments of catastrophic wartime humor, like the conversation between MacMahon the manager and Carl the efficiency man, when they both fall through the conveyor in the dark, or the dinner with Mr. Digby the big boss at the MacMahon's house after the riot. If the material of the book were completely clarified, and if the people—Robert Cantwell has a very good ear for the way people talk—were completely created, this would be a very great novel; as it is, it is an instructive and important attempt to work out a method of dealing truly and from the inside with industrial life. This is going to take longer than a day or a year to work out.

It seems to me that this novel is written more from the inside than any Russian book about a factory I've read. After all, we've been accustomed to machines longer than the Russians have and ought to begin to know something about them. To tell truly, and not romantically or sentimentally, about the relation between men and machines, and to describe the machine worker, are among the most important tasks before novelists today. The job has only begun. I think Robert Cantwell is as likely to discover a method of coping with machinery, which is now the core of human life, as any man writing today.

JOHN DOS PASSOS.

Morituri Salutamus

Nazi Means War, by Leland Stowe. New York: Whittlesey House. 151 pages. $1.50.

The Long Roll on the Rhine, by E. Alexander Powell. New York: The Macmillan Company. 231 pages. $2.50.

Germany Prepares for War, by Ewald Banse. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 374 pages and 12 maps. $3.

Can We Limit War? by Hoffman Nickerson. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. 329 pages. $2.75.

SOME HYPOTHESES can be verified only by experimentation. The hypothesis that civilization will be destroyed by another general war falls into this category. Some experiments can be performed only once. The second imperialist war, wherein the hypothesis will be tested, may easily prove to be unique, final and conclusive. It is this very circumstance that fascinates the experimenters and drives them forward furiously toward the great event. Pending its arrival, plowshares must be beaten into swords, masses of patriots must be beaten into cannon fodder, and the literati must be beaten into persuasive glorifiers of collective arson, murder and suicide. All three processes are going forward rapidly throughout the world—most rapidly where fascism is in power. Here the bourgeois élite, having discarded democracy in its desperate death agony, rules by terror and by the ancient trickery of beating tom-toms and chanting hymns of hate against foreign foes. To avoid strangulation in gutted home markets, to wrest the lean profits of a shrinking world from the grasp of competitors, to escape finally from internal social explosion, the embattled fascist apostles of property and conquest must resort at last to the experiment of war.

LICENSED TO UNT CRC
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nazi militarism by a careful and reflective journalist. It errs on the side of understatement. The author's "million men in uniform" have already, by official admission, become two and a half millions (S.A., S.S. and Stahlhelm) since he wrote. But one has nevertheless available here an accurate and well balanced picture of the material and psychic rearmament of the Third Reich. The conclusion flows not from alarmist fears but from the incontrovertible facts: Germany, given arms and allies, will inevitably embark upon a career of military aggression and imperialistic aggrandizement.

Colonel Powell's purpose is apparently to conceal this and other ominous aspects of Hitlerism from the English-reading world. Here is another journalist, but one with a mission other than that of reporting facts. I assume he is not paid by Berlin, but he should be. His work is a model of subtlety and persuasiveness in comparison with the clumsy fabrications of the official Nazi propaganda agencies. His "roll" on the Rhine is the roll of Nazi drums. He purports to tell, "fairly," "objectively," the story of the National Socialist Revolution. He, too, condemns atrocities, anti-Semitism and saber-rattling. But the reader must see the "truth": vicious Jews overran Germany's public and professional life (as proved by quotations from Lord Rothermere); the Nazis rescued the Reich from a bloody Communist uprising, all planned when the brave Brown Shirts saved the citizenry from butchery; Hitler wants peace (as proved by his speeches); the misfortunes of Germany's Jews are "relatively unimportant"; Der Führer is a great man, for he entertained and charmed Colonel Powell; the noble Göring (vain, yes, and once in an asylum) is really as gentle as a sucking dove; Göbbels is a genius; all are fine fellows, victimized by scoundrelly Israelite propagandists abroad; war?—never!—but Germany must be given guns and bombing planes, the Polish Corridor, Upper Silesia, Austria and other playthings and prizes, for there must be "justice"! Colonel Powell may, just possibly, be merely naïve—but what a convenient naïveté for Hitler!

The English publishers of Herr Banse's book intended it to reveal to the Anglo-Saxon world the wickedness of Nazi war preparations. Their choice was ill made. The author is professor of Military Science in Brunswick. His "Wehrwissenschaft" and his "Raum und Volk im Weltkriege" ("Germany Prepares for War" is a misleading title) were both suppressed in Germany because of foreign criticism. Were he a genuine strategist or in any way representative of the abler Hitlerite war-makers, the translation of his book would be most useful. But he is only a pseudo-geographer, a literary hack and a fool. The cult of blood and thunder is here, but it is far better presented in the writings of Hitler, Rosenberg, Spengler and a dozen other Nazi intellectuals. As for his "military science," it is drivel: stale commentaries on the tactics of the Great War and vague yearnings for the glory to come. For the completely uninitiated this work may prove illuminating as a primer of the Nazi military mind. But for those who know, Herr Banse must be dismissed as a fourth-rate minor villain. When *Der Tag* comes, the fascist war lords will have far abler and more intelligent technicians of mass murder at their disposal than this feeble sponsor of bacteriological warfare and *Schrecklichkeit*.

Hoffman Nickerson's well written and stimulating treatise is a curious blend of sense and nonsense. The nonsense is of the fascist variety: war is inevitable because of "human [illegible]"; soldiering is noble and heroic; civilizations decay turning war into "mass massacre"; dictatorships are pacific; etc. The sense has mostly to do with diplomacy, strategy and American policy. The author's advice on army organization and on a foreign policy designed to keep the United States at peace is challenging and intelligible. And his central thesis is interesting. It is that the destructiveness of modern warfare is due to its "unlimited" mass character, introduced by Napoleon. War cannot be abolished, but it can be "limited" as to objectives and as to weapons. Increasing mechanization offers hope of such limitation if it leads to a return to small, professional armies in place of huge conscript forces. But even the thesis looks a little like the wishful thinking of a military romanticist who fears more the abolition of war by civilization than the abolition of civilization by war.

Nickerson is full of nostalgia for glory, minus mud and blood. "War . . . need not lose the glamor which has never failed the man-at-arms and has always at least dignified his tomb. To face death will never be other than heroic . . . the professional soldier . . . has a poetry of his own." This "poetry" is that of Herr Banse, Colonel Powell, Herr Hitler, Messrs. Mussolini, Dollfuss, Horthy and Araki. It is inspired by the fear and bravado of a ruling class that is insecure and sick in body and mind. It is the poetry of Faith. Says Nickerson, at the end, "the sword that shall establish our peace will have its blade straight and its hilt in the form of a cross." Some crosses are iron—on the chests of heroes. But more are wooden—over the graves of the dead.

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN.

Books in Brief

BIOGRAPHY AND MEMOIRS

THE LOG OF A LIMEJUICER, as told to Roland Barker by James P. Barker. *New York: The Huntington Press. 251 pages, illustrated. $2.50.*

The present well made volume, whatever you may infer from the title, is not a memoir of Captain Barker's forty-four years at sea. His training and early experiences are there, but seem only to introduce the main story of one incredible voyage around the Horn in 1905. To begin with, he was not just any old captain. He had sensibility, and a special feeling for such purely professional matters as a ship and the men on it. But when he got his anchor up, he got his anchor up, and off we go, sir, come fire in the hold, a sulky mate, mutiny, hell or high water. So for fifty-two days and not a moment less, that year off the Horn, he whanged his ship into a gray welter of wind, ice and sea, the like you'd never dream of, driving and smashing and almost sinking it under him, while others gave up and sneaked off around the world. He got through; he is proud; and well he may be. And even though he had to use an iron hand on them, he shares the glory with his bully boys, his hearts of oak. That is, with such of them as did not get lost in the scuffle. For the six who died, the six or eight more maimed, he indicates regret. He nailed up his record, however; such is the sea, he hints. It is a rare powerful story, and very much between the lines.

O. C. F.

THE ODYSSEY OF ANDREW SWAN, as told by himself and written down by Dugald MacFadyen. *New York: Henry Holt and Company. 270 pages. $2.50.*

Have patience with Mr. MacFadyen, a most literal and helter-skelter amanuensis, not infrequently to be observed floundering woodenly amongst his own and his principal's feet, and you will find a rather genuine and likable character in this Andrew Swan, as he goes knocking about the known world with foc'sle hands

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He has done a power of things that would not occur to the average taxpayer, but over this alone it would be hard to work up much steam: his flavor derives mostly from what he has made of himself and why. He is Scotch, full of native shrewdness, and with a fair gusto for music and places and the ways of doing a thing; he is as homely and stalwart as oatmeal, and if he does not like a chap he will spit in his eye. "Not money," he says, "or fame, but independence," and knowing his need and how to satisfy it, he has stood on his two feet and made his strange way, looking people and things sharply over and drawing independent conclusions, some of them sound and others sententious, but all of them mixed with wonder and hope and tolerance and humor. O. C. F.

Public Questions

TREATIES DEFEATED BY THE SENATE, by W. Stull Holt. *Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 335 pages. $3.*

In this thorough study of the struggle between the President and the Senate over the conduct of foreign relations, the author, a member of the department of History of Johns Hopkins University, demonstrates that treaties are seldom defeated in the Senate because of their defects, but almost invariably because of partisan considerations. Mr. Holt has examined not only the official documents, but also the unpublished papers of a large number of American statesmen. He shows how Russia bribed American congressmen in order to obtain the ratification of the treaty for the purchase of Alaska, and again how Senator Grey dropped his opposition to the Treaty of Paris and was rewarded with a judgeship in the Circuit Court. The one conclusion that emerges from this distinctly valuable contribution to the history of American diplomacy is that the United States will not have a fully responsible foreign policy until the present veto exercised by one-third of the Senate is modified. R. L. B.

THE SOVIET STATE, by Bertram W. Maxwell. *Topeka: Stews and Wayburn. 400 pages. $3.50.*

This scholarly work is "an attempt to describe the structure of the Bolshevik government and to portray the relationship of the citizen to the state in the Soviet Union."

Contributors

William Orton is professor of Economics and Sociology at Smith College. He is the author of "Labor in Transition," a history of the British labor movement.

Harrison Forman, author, explorer and lecturer, has spent about four years in the Orient. He was general manager of one of the largest organizations in the Orient engaged in the sale of American military aircraft to the Chinese government, and is a frequent contributor to newspapers and periodicals on the subject of exploration, aviation and political problems in the Far East.

Jesse Stuart, a native of the Kentucky mountains, is the author of a volume of verse to be published shortly by by E. P. Dutton and Company. He is an older brother of James Stuart, whose verse, "Five Graduates of Fishbone," appeared in The New Republic of April 4.

Horace Gregory is the author of "Pilgrim of the Apocalypse," a critical study of D. H. Lawrence, and of two volumes of verse, "Chelsea Rooming House" and "No Retreat."

Quincy Howe is editor of The Living Age.

John Dos Passos, author of "Three Soldiers," "Manhattan Transfer," "The 42nd Parallel" and "1919," is now in Provincetown. His travel book, "In All Countries," has just been published by Harcourt, Brace and Company. A volume of his dramatic works, "Three Plays," will appear on May 17.

Frederick L. Schuman is assistant professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago. He is the author of "International Politics."

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Otis C. Ferguson and Raymond Leslie Buell.

This book that has something new, startling and important to say about modern life

Lewis Mumford's TECHNICS AND CIVILIZATION

By the author of "The Golden Day," "Sticks and Stones," etc.

STUART CHASE, N. Y. Herald Tribune: "The most lucid and persuasive exposition of the promise of technics in human terms that it has been my good fortune to read."

HERSCHEL BRICKELL, N. Y. Post: "The most absorbing book I have read on the origins of the civilization with which we have to live, and of which we are, willy-nilly, a part."

CLIFTON FADIMAN, New Yorker: "Like many serious books it is more entertaining than most frivolous ones. . . . I think it contains the sanest, truest, and also the most legitimately hopeful things that have been said about our machine civilization in the last few years."

HARRY HANSEN, N. Y. World-Telegram: "It is quite impossible to indicate . . . the richness of Mr. Mumford's study. . . . Marks the peak of Lewis Mumford's writings on man's activities. . . . "

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN, N. Y. Times: "The story he has to tell is utterly fascinating . . . impossible to review in a short space with any feeling on the part of the reviewer of justice done."

WALDEMAR KAEMPFFERT, N. Y. Times: "A brilliant historical and critical account . . . A necessary account, one for which we have waited too long in English."

Illustrated, $4.50

HARCOURT, BRACE AND CO.
383 Madison Avenue, New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THIS SUMMER...CRUISE THE WHOLE
MEDITERRANEAN
INCLUDING THE HOLY LAND, THE ADRIATIC, EGYPT, TURKEY, THE BLACK SEA and SOVIET RUSSIA on the
ROMA
FROM NEW YORK
JUNE 30
53 DAYS • 22 CALLS

Including:
MADEIRA
GIBRALTAR
MALAGA
MONTE CARLO
GENOA
NAPLES
TAORMINA
BEYROUTH
HAIFA
PORT SAID
RHODES
ISTANBUL
ODESSA
YALTA
PHALERON (Athens)
CATTARO BAY
RAGUSA
VENICE
CANNES

A long cruise at low cost—showing you *all* you've wanted to see in the Mediterranean and the Near East! Turkey—Soviet Russia's Riviera—and of course the Holy Land, Egypt and Athens. Celebrated "Lido" ship with great Lido Deck, tiled pool. Observation Bridge for passengers, dining salon on Promenade Deck; Finest Italian Line cuisine, service, entertainment. Tourist quarters include entire former Second Class.

FIRST CLASS $600 up.
TOURIST $325 up.

Apply local agent or 1 State St., New York

ITALIAN LINE
In Cooperation with
THOS. COOK & SON, WAGONS-LITS, INC.

HOW TO PREVENT WAR
DEBATE
Through World Court, League of Nations, says
CLARK M. EICHELBERGER
Director of League of Nations Association
Through Economic and Political Change, says
CLARENCE A. HATHAWAY
Editor Daily Worker
Chairman: ROGER BALDWIN
Director American Civil Liberties Union
TOWN HALL 113 West 43rd Street MAY 16, 8:30 P.M.
Auspices: Social Workers Discussion Club Admission, 50c

THEATRE

THE THEATRE UNION *Presents*
THE SEASON'S OUTSTANDING DRAMATIC HIT!
stevedore
by PAUL PETERS and GEORGE SKLAR. Directed by MICHAEL BLANKFORT
Thrilling drama of Negro and white workers on the docks of New Orleans
"An evening of unquenchable excitement."—*Garland, World Telegram*
CIVIC REPERTORY THEATRE
14th Street and Sixth Avenue
Evenings, 8:45; Mats. Tues. and Sat. 2:45
30c — 45c — 60c — 75c — $1.00 and $1.50

SUMMER PLACES

DECORATION DAY FIESTA
Five Days of relaxation and gaiety at
• AN ADIRONDACK CAMP
NOTED FOR ITS
BEAUTY AND MODERNITY
PRIVATE GOLF COURSE
• Write for details
GREEN MANSIONS
11 W. 42nd St., Col. 5-6346
Lena Barish : Sam Garlen
Directors

In the Adirondack Woods
Fifteen furnished cottages scattered over extensive private estate adjoining two mile lake and surrounded by State forests offer a vacation where nature's beauties remain unspoiled. Cooking facilities at all cottages, also meals or rooms at Big Shanty. Lake activities, trails to near-by peaks and tennis. Illustrated booklet.
FRANK C. HOOPER
Big Shanty North River, N. Y.

SPRING WEEK-ENDS

Western View Farm
An Inn unique in its hospitality
Fifteenth Season
Rates: $8.00 a day, $49.00 a week
Monthly and Seasonal Rates on Request
Address
EDWARD G. OHMER, NEW MILFORD, CONN.
Telephone: New Milford 440

CARE FOR CHILDREN

Anne (4½) and Paul (2½) will share their Dutchess County home, barns, fields, and pets this summer with four other normal children. Constant care by thoroughly trained nursery school teachers selected and supervised by the parents of Anne and Paul. Pediatrician on call. References required and furnished. Interviews in New York by arrangement. Box 820, The New Republic.

SOUTHERNER OF GOOD FAMILY, aged 21, graduate of Science Hill, Shelbyville, Kentucky, and of the Louisville Normal School, would tutor children (through eighth grade work), look after them generally and thoroughly enjoy the job. Address Miss Mary Alice Pickett, 2573 Ransdell Avenue, Louisville, Kentucky.

SUMMER RENTALS

For Rent Furnished. Writer's home in village, 6 rooms on 3 floors. Colonial house, garden, fireplace, radio, frigidaire, books, pictures, gas free. $80 till October. CHel. 2-7855.

RESTFUL SUMMER HOME, completely furnished, southern Vermont. Beautiful open view, large living room, fireplace, kitchen, bathroom, 4 bedrooms, porches, 2 sleeping cabins, garage. 1300 feet elevation. 80 acres mountainside woodland. French, 19 Tibbits Ave., White Plains, N. Y.

SUMMIT, N. J. Summer rental; furnished, white Colonial; 10 rooms; 3 baths; 2 car garage; attractive garden. Phone JOhn 4-1780 or write Box 828, The New Republic.

FURNISHED APARTMENT, 4 outside rooms, complete kitchen, shower. Quiet, airy, cool, comfortable. $100 season. MO 2-8648, or Box 827, New Republic.

(58 W. 70th, Central Park). Artistically furnished, two rooms and kitchenette, radio, fireplace, library. June 1 to Sept. 1. $55. Oppenheim, SUsquehanna 7-4914, after five.

FOR SALE

AN ACRE—AT ONE VACATION'S COST in Westchester hills, one hour from New York. NON-PROFIT project; cultured persons. Highest character, piped water, etc., privacy. C. Rick, Crompond Rd., Peekskill N. Y. The Solution for Depreciating Currency.

FOR RENT

HALF MY HOME—3 large rooms, kitchen, bath, porch, improvements. 15 acres, hilly, privacy, commuting, accessible swimming, tennis. Box 238, Nanuet, Rockland Co., N. Y.

APARTMENT FOR RENT

MODERN APARTMENT, furnished or unfurnished, 5 rooms, 2 baths, 3 exposures, cool, quiet. Sublease, [illegible] Gramercy 5-5739

BOOKS

VARIED BOOKS

BOOKS, OUT-OF-PRINT, special subjects. Any of following lists available: Economics; Americana; Nautica; Liquors; Precious Stones; Clockmaking; First Editions; Narcotics; Medicine; or your subject if not listed. Richard S. Wormser, 22 W. 48th St., New York.

RUSSIAN BOOKS

BOOKS ABOUT RUSSIAN HISTORY and economics, pre-war and Soviet publications in English and Russian. Rosen, 410 Riverside Drive, N. Y. C.

FIRST EDITIONS

FIRST EDITIONS AND GOOD BOOKS. Books by and concerning Walt Whitman. Catalogue 70 now ready. Alfred G. Goldsmith, 42 Lexington Avenue, New York.

HOUSE OF BOOKS, LTD., 555 Madison Avenue, New York. Modern first editions and current books.

OUT-OF-PRINT BOOKS

FORMER LIBRARIAN specializes completing libraries, also procuring out-of-print books; reasonable. Rosen, 410 Riverside Drive, City.

POSITION WANTED

AGED 25, financially desperate, cultured, Yale University, music, theatre, typing, any light work, caretaker, companion, drive, country. Box 826, New Republic.

ORANGES FOR SALE

ORANGES, sweet juicy, sun ripened on trees; picked, shipped same day. Delivered express prepaid, $2.75 bushel basket. Satisfaction guaranteed. A. H. Burket, Sebring, Florida.

Summer Resorts

The special summer resort rate is $4.00 an inch, (measuring 1 x 2¼ inches) for one insertion; $3.50 an inch an insertion for three insertions; and $3.00 an inch, an insertion, for six insertions. The minimum space is half an inch at half the rates quoted above. Larger space proportionately more. Advertising Dept., The New Republic, 421 W. 21st St., New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED